


Leonard R. Cutter

July 1, 1825 - July 13, 1894

No. *CS 71.C99 1898*

Copy 2



GIVEN BY

Mrs. C. A. Bevelow

3/23/30



Leonard R. Cutter

LEONARD R. CUTTER.

In Memoriam.

July 1, 1845—July 15, 1894.

EDITED BY
FRANKLIN DIXON.
1894.
I.



Samuel J. May

[Fogelov, Agnes Elizabeth (Cutter)]

LEONARD R. CUTTER.

* 442,403

In Memoriam.

July 1, 1825—July 13, 1894.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON
BOSTON:

PRIVATELY PRINTED.

1898.

C

*CS 71

.C99

1898

Copy 2

ILLUSTRATED AND PRINTED

BY

THE BEALE PRESS,

BOSTON, MASS.

Wm. C. Beale
1898

WASHER & SONS
105 N. 7th St.
PHILADELPHIA

TO MY CHILDREN

I Dedicate this Book,

WITH DEEPEST FEELINGS OF GRATITUDE AND LOVE FOR MY
DEAR PARENTS, TO WHOM I OWE ALL THAT IS OF USE
AND PLEASURE TO ME; HOPING THAT LESSONS
OF HONESTY, FIDELITY, INDEPENDENCE AND
CONSCIENTIOUS FOLLOWING OF DUTY
MAY BE LEARNED FROM THIS SIMPLE
STORY OF THE LIFE OF THEIR
GRANDFATHER.

"An honest man is the noblest work of God."

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER	I.	Family	I
CHAPTER	II.	Childhood and School Life	18
CHAPTER	III.	Early Years in Boston	32
CHAPTER	IV.	Life in Boston, 1852-1860	41
CHAPTER	V.	1860-1870	64
CHAPTER	VI.	1870-1874	73
CHAPTER	VII.	Connection with Water Board, 1871-1883	137
CHAPTER	VIII.	Home Life	254
CHAPTER	IX.	Personal Reminiscences	284
CHAPTER	X.	Last Days	290
APPENDIX			294

ILLUSTRATIONS.

LEONARD R. CUTTER	Frontispiece
DANIEL CUTTER, SALLY J. CUTTER	Facing page 2
BIRTHPLACE, JAFFREY, N. H., July 1, 1825	" " 18
SITE OF BIRTHPLACE AND THE OLD OAK	" " 26
CUTTER FAMILY	" " 34
HOMESTEAD, JAFFREY, N. H. (from an old drawing)	" " 50
HOMESTEAD, JAFFREY, N. H. (from a photograph) .	" " 58
NO. 11 DISTRICT SCHOOLHOUSE, JAFFREY, N. H.	" " 66
JAFFREY ACADEMY	" " 74
LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE TWENTY	" " 90
OLD CHURCH IN JAFFREY, N. H.	" " 98
LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE TWENTY-FIVE	" " 106
PLACE OF BUSINESS, COR. OF GROVE AND PHILLIPS STREETS, 1850-1858	" " 114
RESIDENCE, 2 GROVE PLACE	" " 122
RESIDENCE, 14 GROVE STREET, 1855-1864	" " 130
PLACE OF BUSINESS, 77 AND 67 LEVERETT STREET, 1858-1894	" " 138
LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE THIRTY-SEVEN. MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE THIRTY-EIGHT	" " 154
LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE FORTY-FIVE	" " 162
MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE FORTY-SIX	" " 170
SUMMER RESIDENCE, JAFFREY, N. H.	" " 186
RESIDENCE, 27 HANCOCK STREET, 1864-1883	" " 202
RESIDENCE, 1 ARLINGTON STREET, 1883-1894	" " 210
DRAWING-ROOM, 1 ARLINGTON STREET	" " 234
LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE SIXTY-SEVEN	" " 242
MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE SIXTY	" " 258
RECEPTION-ROOM, 1 ARLINGTON STREET	" " 282

LEONARD RICHARDSON CUTTER.

CHAPTER I.

FAMILY.

Leonard Richardson Cutter was born in Jaffrey, N. H., July 1, 1825. The house in which he was born, and where he lived the first ten years of his life, was directly under grand old Monadnock. The sun set there an hour earlier than it did in the middle of the town about a mile distant. His parents built the house, and here in the invigorating air, surrounded by the beauties of nature in mountain and valley, were born to them nine children blessed with physical health and strength, which made life a pleasant thing to them all for many years. The youngest sister died in 1856, aged thirty-seven. This was the first death in the family.

In 1864 the mother of the family died, aged seventy-eight. Her maiden name was Sally Jones, and her birthplace was Bedford, Mass. She was a well-educated person, for a time a teacher in the public schools. She was very industrious, very frugal, and of strong religious convictions. She was a member of the Congregational church in Jaffrey, and brought up her large family to constant attendance on church, and with great reverence and respect for everything belonging to religion. She thought a great deal of education. I have heard my father say that he didn't dare to write a letter to his mother without a dictionary at his elbow, as any misspelled words were sure to be noticed and corrected by her. She was a very correct speller.

She brought up her family to be industrious; the daughters, who came especially under her care for a greater length of time, were taught to spin and weave, and do all the different kinds of housework, also to lend a helping hand to their father; for the family was so constructed that the oldest, although a son, was the only son for fourteen years, during which time five girls were born, then followed three sons, the subject of this memorial being next to the youngest. Solomon's description of a good wife and mother was very applicable to her: "She looketh well to

the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her."

Her father, Col. Timothy Jones of Bedford, was of English extraction and a man of prominence in his native town. He was born in 1748. He married Rebecca Bateman, who was born in Concord, Mass., in 1749. They had ten children. He was 2nd lieutenant in Capt. Jonathan Wilson's Company in the Concord fight. The captain came from Amherst, N. H., and was killed that day, April 19, 1775.

In the History of Bedford we find that in 1779 the town of Bedford added to the commissioned officers three citizens to aid them in procuring men for enlistment as soldiers in the war of the Revolution. They were Moses Abbott, Timothy Jones and Jonas Gleason.

In the County Convention at Concord, August 23, 1786, "to consult on matters of public grievance, under which the people labor," John Merriam and Timothy Jones represented the town of Bedford. They were active in all measures adopted to quiet the minds of the people, who attempted to oppose the government.

Col. Timothy Jones lived on what is called the Murray place very early. The present dwelling was built by him very soon after the Revolutionary War. It was a superior house of that day. Reuben Duren of the town was the architect. The council at the ordination of Rev. Samuel Stearns was entertained here in a manner befitting the occasion. The place is now owned by Temple and Beard, and occupied for a nursery.

In the churchyard are the stones erected to Mr. and Mrs. Jones; the inscriptions read as follows:

TIMOTHY JONES, ESQ., JUNE 1, 1804, AGED 55.

The sweet remembrance of the just
Shall flourish when they sleep in dust.

MRS. REBEKAH, WIFE OF TIMOTHY JONES, ESQ.

Aug. 13, 1807, aged 58.
Friends and physicians could not save
My mortal body from the grave.

The following obituary notice was written by Mrs. Sally (Jones) Cutter:

"Col. Jones died in Bedford, June 1, 1804, aged 55. His funeral solemnities were attended the Sabbath following. A numerous train of relatives and friends proceeded to the meeting-house where a fervent prayer was made, and a serious and affecting discourse was delivered by the Rev. Mr. Stearns, from Ps. 75: 8. The procession moved thence to



DANIEL CUTTER



SALLY J. CUTTER.

the burying-ground, and his remains were committed to the earth. By this dispensation of Divine Providence, 'his widow was deprived of a kind, tender and affectionate husband,' the church and town of a 'long active and useful member,' and mankind of a 'sincere friend.' He was 'excellent in his counsels, wise and courteous in his behavior, and kind and benevolent to all men.' "

I. The emigrant ancestor of this family was Rev. John Jones, who was born in England, came to this country Oct. 6, 1635, was settled in Cambridge in 1648, freeman in 1650, removed to Concord, and died there June 22, 1673. He had six children.

II. His third son, named Rev. *John Jones*, was born July 6, 1656, in Concord, and died there in 1726. He married Sarah Farwell,* March 5, 1681. They had four children; the eldest son, named John, was the lineal descendant in this family.

III. John Jones 3rd was born in Concord, Jan. 6, 1690. He married Anna Brooks,† Jan. 25, 1716; she was born in Concord, Feb. 21, 1695. They had five children. He died March 12, 1762. She died June 9, 1753.

IV. John Jones, oldest child of John and Anna (Brooks) Jones, was born June 23, 1718, married Abigail Wesson. They had ten children, of which the fifth child, Timothy (Col. Timothy Jones), was the father of Mrs. Sally (Jones) Cutter.

Daniel Cutter survived his wife, Sally Jones, four years, dying at the advanced age of eighty-four, in Jaffrey, Sept. 23, 1868.

* Henry Farwell m. Olive?

d. Aug. 1, 1670. | d. Mar. 1, 1691.

John Farwell m., May 9, 1658, Sarah Wheeler.

b. England. e. 1635. | d. May 23, 1662.

d. at Chelmsford, 1682.

Sarah Farwell.

b. 1662.

† Capt. Thos. Brooks m. Grace?

d. May 21, 1667. | d. May 2, 1662.

Capt. Hugh Mason m. Esther?

b. 1605; e. 1633. | d. May 1, 1692.
d. Oct. 10, 1673.

Joshua Brooks m. Hannah Mason.

m. Oct. 17, 1653. | b. Sept. 23, 1636.

d. 1697.

John Merriam m. Mary.

(Founder of Acton.) Daniel Brooks m., Aug. 9, 1692, Anna Merriam.

b. Nov. 15, 1663. |

b. 1669.

d. Oct. 18, 1733. |

d. 1757.

Anna Brooks.

From the "Cutter Family of New England," I quote the following: "He always lived in his native town of Jaffrey. He was what is called in this section of the country, a farmer; and in his mode of life and habits of industry was a good representative of the hardy yeomanry of New England of his day and generation. Possessed of sound physical health and strength, and early inured to toil, labor seemed a pleasure to him. He was a man of sound judgment, determined will and purpose, indefatigable and persevering, and always ready to encounter and overcome any difficulties that stood in his way. He started in life with a few acres of wild land on the side of Monadnock Mountain, given him by his father, with few or no fences upon it and no buildings. It was mostly covered with the heavy original forests of that section of the country, consisting of the rock maple, black and yellow birch, white-beech, elm and red-oak, and a few scattering spruces, hemlocks, and pines. The soil was hard, heavy and rocky, covered here and there with a huge boulder of granite, and mixed with the small cobble-stones which sadly impede cultivation, and are a sore grievance to the farmers' boys, who are required to gather them into heaps in the early months of the spring to relieve the scythe of the mower.

"This certainly would be an uninviting prospect to the enervated young men of the present day for building up a home and obtaining a livelihood. But with resolute purpose, Mr. Cutter took up the task before him, and entered upon the struggles and labors of a life-time. He cut down the huge forest trees, cleared up the land, built stone fences around his pastures and tillage land, erected his houses and barns and filled the latter with flocks and herds. He purchased other adjoining land to the extent of six or seven hundred acres and from this wild, rugged mountain tract, by his own industry and perseverance, he carved out a beautiful farm and truly made the wilderness 'blossom as the rose.' He fulfilled at least this Scripture, 'Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work,' to the letter, and 'in the sweat of thy face, shalt thou eat bread.' But his was the life of the independent New England farmer. His farm furnished himself and family with nearly all the necessities of life. His cattle, sheep and swine furnished him with meats for every season of the year. His fields furnished him with wheat for flour and barley, rye and corn for meal, and potatoes and other vegetables for his table. The rock maple, growing upon his farm, afforded all necessary sugar and molasses for his family. The wool from his sheep furnished the family with clothing. This was taken in the raw material and made into cloth

and wrought into garments under his own roof, with the exception of dyeing and dressing, which were done at a clothier's mill in the village near by. The carding, spinning and weaving were done by his wife and daughters, and a tailoress annually came to the house and made up the garments for the father and sons. From the hides of his cattle, slaughtered for food, were made the boots and shoes for his family. The hides were tanned at a neighboring tannery, 'at the halves,' as it was termed; and a shoemaker came to his house with bench and tools and remained till the family were well supplied with shoes.

"This was once the mode of life of the New England farmer—a life of toil indeed, but virtuous, honest, independent and happy. The rise and fall of stocks, the failures in trade, and the crises in the money market never disturbed his sleep. Mr. Cutter's whole life was spent upon his farm. He never had any idle hours for vain amusements, and in his view laziness was a crime.

"He was always an early riser—up with the dawn and working until twilight—and he always enjoyed good, sound health, never having had to employ a physician until he was sixty years of age and upwards. Himself feeling the want of early school education, he was always desirous of giving his children all the advantages the schools of New England afforded, and sent them all first to the common district schools, and afterwards to the academies of learning, and three of his sons to Dartmouth College.

"Mr. Cutter was in every sense of the word an honest man, and in all his dealings with his fellowmen acted upon the golden rule, to do by others as he would wish others to do by him, and always gave a full equivalent for everything he received. He lived upon his own industry, and not by speculation upon the industry of others, and during a long life was a most useful and excellent citizen of the community in which he dwelt."

Mr. Cutter was of English extraction, belonging to the sixth generation from the first emigrants born in New England. It may be of interest to mention the members of the direct line and a few of their characteristics.

1. In 1640 Elizabeth Cutter, a widow, came to New England from Newcastle-on-the-Tyne. She was quite in years when she bade farewell to her native country; but she came over to be with her daughter, Mrs. Barbara Corlet. She sojourned about twenty years in the family of her "very loveing sonne," Mr. Elijah Corlet, the husband of her daughter Barbara and the "memorable old schoolmaster in Cambridge." Three

of her children emigrated to this country—sons, William and Richard and the daughter above named. Elizabeth Cutter died at Cambridge the 10th of January, 1663-4, aged eighty-nine years.

2. Richard, the younger son of Elizabeth, was with his mother when she emigrated, about the year 1640. He was probably under twenty years of age at the time of his arrival, and unmarried. He was a cooper by trade.

Richard became entitled to suffrage in the election of the colonial magistrates by his admission as freeman, June 2, 1641. The privilege was earnestly desired by every man, and all freemen at that period were required to be "orthodox, members of the church, twenty years old, and worth £200." The oath sworn at admission required them to be "true and faithful" subjects of the Commonwealth, to "yield assistance and support thereunto" with person and estate; "maintain and preserve" all her "liberties and privileges;" submit to her "wholesome laws;" never "plot nor practice" evil against her, nor "consent to any that shall so do," but "timely discover and reveal the same to lawful authority for the speedy preventing thereof."

Moreover they solemnly bound themselves "in the sight of God," that whenever called to give their voice "touching any such matter of the state wherein freemen were to deal," they would give their "vote and suffrage" as they judged in their own consciences might best "conduce and tend to the public weal of the body" without respect of persons or favor of man.

He became a member of the Artillery Company in 1643. This association, formed in 1637, met for improvement in discipline and tactics, and comprised the leaders and officers of the volunteer "train-bands" and the principal magistrates and citizens. The first regularly organized company in America, "it may be considered the germ from which all our military character in New England, if not in the United States, has sprung, and exists still under the name of the "Ancient and Honorable Artillery" of Boston.

About 1644 Richard married his wife Elizabeth, whose surname is unknown. Her tombstone is one of the oldest now standing in the ancient burying ground of Old Cambridge.

Here Lyes Ye Body of
ELIZABETH CUTTER
WIFE TO RICHARD CUTTER
Aged About 42 Years
Died March 5, 1661-2

Feb. 14, 1662-3, Richard married Frances (Perriman) Amsden, the widow of Isaac Amsden, or Emsden, of Cambridge. She survived Richard's decease.

Richard's residence was in Menotomy. He requested to be buried in "Cambridge burying-place" and near his first wife's grave. His monumental stones are in the western part of the yard, about eight paces distant from the marble obelisk of "Livermore, Wilder and Sheafe." The inscription is perfectly legible:

Here Lyes Ye Body of
RICHARD CUTTER
Aged About 72 Years
Died Ye 16 of June 1693

He was the father of fourteen children, seven by each wife. The ancestor in which we are particularly interested in this memorial sketch is Ephraim, who was the fifth child and whose mother was the first wife, Elizabeth, whose surname is not known.

3. Ephraim Cutter was born at Charlestown in 1651, and was baptized at Cambridge. He was a glazier by trade, and resided successively in Cambridge, Charlestown, and Watertown Farms, now Weston.

Feb. 11, 1678-9, he married Bethia* Wood, daughter of Nicholas and Mary (Williams) Wood of Medfield, born July 28, 1660. While resident in Charlestown, he drew pay as an officer in Philip's war. The date of his decease is unknown. His wife was interred in Watertown. They had eight children, the youngest, John, in this line of ancestry.

4. John Cutter was born at Watertown, July 23, 1700, married Rachel Powers. Like his father, he was a glazier by trade, and resided at Lexington and Woburn, where he paid church rates from 1724 to 1734. The following interesting items from the parish records convey to posterity the method in which he performed the "setting" of glass.

* Robert Williams m. Elizabeth Stratton.

b. Norwich, Eng.	b. England, 1594.
e. Roxbury, 1637.	d. July 28, 1674, aged 80.
d. Sept. 1, 1693.	

Nicholas Wood m. Mary Williams.

Lived in Dorchester.	b. England.
e. 1640.	e. 1637.
d. Feb. 7, 1670.	d. Feb. 19, 1662.
Bethia Wood.	

1732. "paid to mr. John Cutter for mending ye meeting-house Glass and finding nails £3. 13. 00." "To mr. simon Thompson, Jun. for assisting mr. Cutter in Nailing up ye meeting-house Glass and finding nails, £00. 04. 00."

1734. "To mr. John Cutter for mending ye meeting-house Glass £1. 5. 0."

His gravestone in Lexington old burying-ground is the only Cutter memorial found there. It exhibits evidences of transplantation from the original site, and stands not far from the entrance of the yard. The inscription reads:

Here Lies Buried Ye Body of
MR. JOHN CUTTER,
Who Departed This Life
Novembr ye 20th, A. D. 1747,
In Ye 48th Year of His Age.

His estate was administered by Rachel, his widow, administratrix,—his son, John Cutter, "Glazier," and Samuel Winship, "Gent," being bondsmen. His inventory amounted to £308.

Rachel, wife of John Cutter, became a church member at Woburn, Nov. 19, 1756. She afterwards married Barnabas Davis from Littleton, Mass., and removed with her husband to New Ipswich, N. H., to dwell with her eldest son, John Cutter, the next ancestor in the line we are tracing.

After her son's death in 1771, Mr. and Mrs. Davis and Rachael Cutter, her oldest daughter, resided some time in the family of Joseph Cutter, her grandson, of Jaffrey, N. H. She died at the residence of her son, Benjamin Cutter of Temple, near the close of the eighteenth century. She had nine children named Cutter.

5. John Cutter, Jr., was born at Woburn, Jan. 9, 1726-7; married, Nov. 16, 1749, Susanna, daughter of Joseph and Lydia (Brown) Hastings, of Waltham, born May 26, 1731.

I have found the family history of this ancestor, Susanna Hastings, so interesting that I will insert here certain facts which I have collected from the Hastings Memorial. Her ancestry can be directly traced from Henry, lord of Hastings.

"IV. Susanna (Hastings) Cutter was the ninth child of Joseph and Lydia (Brown) Hastings, born May 26, 1731, married Nov. 16, 1749.

"III. Joseph Hastings, her father, was the eighth child (5th son) of

John and Abigail (Hammond)* Hastings, baptized July 10, 1698, and married Oct. 2, 1716, to Lydia Brown,† daughter of Capt. Abraham and Mary Hyde Brown, of Watertown. She died and he married for his second wife, Jan. 16, 1769, Sarah, daughter of Deacon Isaac and Elizabeth (Child) Stearns, born May 22, 1744. His homestead on which he lived and died was on the Trapoli Road, now called North Street. He was a housewright and farmer. He was selectman of Waltham 1748. He died March 23, 1783, aged 85. He had fourteen children.

"II. John Hastings 2nd, son of Deacon Thomas and Margaret (Cheney) Hastings, born in Watertown. March 1st, 1654, married, June 18th, 1679, Abigail, dau. of Lieut. John and Abigail Hammond of Watertown, born June 21, 1656.

"In 1690 her father's assessment was the largest in town, and she received from his estate what in those early days of the Colony was called quite a property. Mr. Hastings's homestead was in that part of Watertown that, in 1737, was made a separate town—Waltham. In the old graveyard in that town is a gravestone bearing date of his death, March 28, 1717-8. Within ten days both had died, leaving eight children.

"I. Thoms Hastings, aged 29, and his wife, Susanna, embarked at Ipswich, England, April 10, 1634, in the Elizabeth, Wm. Andrews, master, for New England, and settled in Watertown, Mass., then known as 'The Massachusetts Bay Colony,' where he was admitted freeman, May 6, 1635. He laid down a lot in Dedham in 1635 or 1636, but never lived there. He was selectman from 1638 to 1643, and again from 1650 to 1671; town clerk 1671, 1677, 1680; representative in 1673, and long held the office of deacon.

"His wife, Susanna, died Feb. 2, 1650, and he married, April, 1651, Margaret Cheney, daughter of Wm. and Martha Cheney of Roxbury,

* Thomas Hammond m., May 14, 1573, Rose Trippe.

b. in England.

d. 1589.

William Hammond m. Elizabeth Payne.

b. Oct. 20, 1575.

b. 1580.

d. Oct. 8, 1662.

d. 1670.

Lieut. John Hammond m. Sarah?

b. in Ipswich, Eng., 1627.

b. 1643.

e. 1634.

d. Jan. 14, 1688.


d. Nov. 22, 1709.

Abigail Hammond.

† See page 10.

ANCESTRY OF LYDIA BROWN.

* Thos. Browne of Haukedon, Eng.



Mass. She was the mother of all his children. He died in 1685, aged 80. According to Inventory dated Sept. 9, 1685, he owned two farms and as many as fifteen other lots, his real estate amounting to £421. He was legatee for seven lots, the remainder he purchased. The west side of School Street, then called Hill Street, was always his residence, which he enlarged by the purchase of the lot of H. Bright, Senior. This homestead passed to his son Samuel. They had eight children. He was a great-grandson of a younger brother of Henry Hastings, 3rd Baron Hastings. The first of the family who enjoyed the peerage in England was Henry, lord of Hastings, son of Wm. de Hastings, steward of Henry II. They were allied by marriage to the royal family of Scotland and England. George, the third lord Hastings, was in 1529 created Earl of Huntingdon, had sons who became Puritans, and were obliged by persecution to leave their native land and find homes in the New World. As early as 1634 we find Thomas Hastings and wife arrived on this shore, and, in 1638, John and family had followed. That they were brothers was a tradition in the family; but it has not been clearly shown, and it is more probable they were cousins, Thomas being descended from a younger brother of the Earl of Huntingdon. The Hastings motto is 'In Veritate Victoria.'

"The family of Hastings has had nineteen peerages. Three now exist with scarcely an heir to bear the title. But from the younger sons of that family, who came to the New World for conscience' sake and established themselves through many privations, little dreamed of in 'Merry England,' numerous sons and daughters have founded homes from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean and from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the tropical regions of South America."

John Cutter, Jr., was a glazier. He appears to have resided at Waltham for a season, and at Lexington, where two children were born to him. Thence he removed to Shrewsbury, Mass., about 1753, and lived there several years. He then located in New Ipswich, N. H., settling about 1767 on "lot 32," a tract of land "North of the old Burial-ground and east of the Mountains."

In 1770 John Cutter and his wife Susanna joined the church at New Ipswich by a public profession of their faith. He pursued the occupation of a farmer at New Ipswich, where his dwelling is still standing. His services as a glazier were in demand in all the country round about, and he was frequently long absent from home on his professional tours to more distant towns.

He was interred in the old graveyard at New Ipswich. His gravestone is slate, two and a half feet in height, and faces the north. It is found on the east side of the yard, about two rods from the wall next the road. Near the top is a human face with wings, below which are the words "memento mori," under which is inscribed the epitaph:

Erected in memory of
MR. JOHN CUTTER,
Who departed this Life,
Sept. 27, 1771,
In the 46th year of his age.

His widow became the second consort of Simeon Gould of New Ipswich, and died in Jaffrey, N. H., August 5, 1827, aged ninety-six years.

I have heard from a child of this great-great-grandmother, who is buried in Jaffrey, and some of whose gold beads were handed down to me. Although my father was only two years old when she died, yet her memory must have been perpetuated by the oldest brother and sisters, who remembered her. She died at my grandfather's home.

John Cutter, Jr., and Susanna Hastings had eleven children; the second son, Joseph, is next in this line.

6. Joseph Cutter was born at Lexington, May 13, 1752; married at Townsend, Mass., "Tuesday," Dec. 5, 1776, to Rachel, daughter of Nehemiah and Rachel (Shattuck) Hobart,* of Pepperell, and a lineal descendant of Rev. Peter Hobart, the first minister of Hingham.

Joseph Cutter, Esq., died in Jaffrey, N. H., June 25, 1840. He was a farmer by vocation, and one of the executors of his father's will in 1771. Not long after his father's death, he removed from New Ipswich to Jaffrey, where the cellar of his dwelling, near the spacious mansion of his son, Joseph Cutter, is still to be seen. During the first year of the revolutionary contest, he was once in active service with its provincial forces before Boston, for which duty he was honored with a pension from the government.

He was of medium height, rather stout in body, and quick and agile in his movements. He was forcible in expression and a man of few words. He held a captaincy in the state militia, and received a commission of Justice of the Peace, but never served in the office.

His wife, Rachel, born April 12, 1750, died in Jaffrey, Jan. 20, 1835. She was amiable and industrious, and possessed an excellent judgment. She had a particular fondness for family antiquities.

* See pages 13 and 14.

HOBART BRANCH.

* Edmund Hobart m. Ann.

b. 1574.

d. June 23, 1649.

e. 1633.

d. Mar. 8, 1646.

Rev. Peter Hobart.

b. Hingham, Eng., 1604.

First minister of Hingham, Mass.

Grad. at Oxford, 1626;

Sent five sons to Harvard College;

A. M., 1629.

four of them were ministers.

Ar. in Ch'st'wn, June 8, 1635.

John Aldis m. Sarah Elliott of Roxbury.

d. Jan. 20, 1679.

Rev. Gershom Hobart m., April 26, 1675, Sarah Aldis.

b. 1645.

b. June 9, 1652.

A. B. Harvard, 1667.

d. April 14, 1712.

Set'd minister at Groton, 1679.

d. Dec. 19, 1707.

Shubael Hobart m., 1714, Martha Prescott.

b. 1681.

b. at Groton, Feb. 20, 1690.

Nehemiah Hobart m., 1741, Rachel Shattuck.

b. Feb. 29, 1717.

b. June 9, 1719, at Watertown.

d. Jan. 5, 1789.

d. Dec. 12, 1796, at Ashburnham.

Selectman and town clerk of Pepperell.

Rachel Hobart.

PRESCOTT BRANCH.

Roger Prescott m., Aug. 20, 1568, Ellen Shaw.

His father was Sir James

Prescott of Dryby, Eng-

land, whose wife was a

daughter of Roger Stand-

ish of Standish, England.

Ralph Prescott m. Ellen?

John Prescott m., Jan. 21, 1629, Mary Platts.

b. Standish, Eng., 1605.

b. Wigan, Eng.

e. 1640.

d. 1683.

He was the first settler of Lancaster,
Mass. Lieutenant in King Will-
iam's War with the Indians.

John Loker m. Mary Draper.

Jonas Prescott m., Dec. 14, 1672, Mary Loker.

b. in Lancaster, June 2, 1648.

b. Sudbury, Sept. 28, 1653.


d. Dec. 31, 1723.

d. Oct. 28, 1730.

He was the grandfather of Col. Wm. Prescott
of Bunker Hill fame, and of the historian
Wm. H. Prescott. He was selectman, town
clerk and representative of Groton. He was
a militia captain.

Martha Prescott, who married Shubael Hobart.

SHATTUCK BRANCH.



In the last years of their lives they owned and lived in the old tavern in the middle of the town, very near the old church. An unmarried daughter named Sabra lived with them. They boarded a number of scholars from out of town, who were attending the Academy. My father delighted to tell of the days when he and his brother Edward attended the Academy. The home farm was about two miles distant, so they would stay at their grandparents' from Monday until Friday night. They would board themselves by bringing provisions from home, but their grandmother would warm and toast the different foods for them. "Aunt Sabra" was of a worrying disposition, disposed to look on the dark side; one day she fell and broke her arm, and father said to her: "Now, Aunt Sabra, you really have something to worry about."

Joseph Cutter and Rachel Hobart had ten children, six sons and four daughters. Five of the sons settled in Jaffrey, on farms, and raised large families; one had eight children, two of them had nine, and two ten. The other son, Nehemiah, was a physician in Pepperell. He was graduated from Middlebury College, Vermont, August, 1814, and M. D. at Yale College, New Haven, in 1817. He commenced practice in Pepperell, became a distinguished physician and founded a private asylum for the insane, which continued in successful operation during his lifetime. In this enterprise he was a pioneer, and his establishment was probably the first of its kind founded in this country. He was married three times. He died March 15, 1859, leaving no issue.

My father enjoyed recounting visits which he made in his youth to his Uncle Nehemiah and the strange vagaries and encounters which he had with some of the insane patients.

The five brothers, Joseph, John, Daniel, Joel and Abel, who were farmers in Jaffrey, were settled near each other, and one of the district schools in Jaffrey was quite filled with their children. These cousins enjoyed themselves together very much. One set were double cousins, as Daniel and Joel married sisters, Sally and Mary Sylvania Jones of Bedford. I know of no better time to mention my father's brothers and sisters than here at the end of this family chapter.

The oldest brother, Daniel Bateman, was born at Jaffrey, May 10, 1808; married, Dec. 8, 1835, Clementina, daughter of Hon. Asa and Fanny (Jewett) Parker, of Jaffrey. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1833, studied medicine with Dr. Luke Howe of Jaffrey and Dr. Nehemiah Cutter of Pepperell, his uncle, and graduated M. D. at Yale Medical School in 1835. He began practice at Ashby, Mass., and in 1837 re-

moved to Peterboro, N. H., where he died. He wrote a history of his native town of Jaffrey. He had two daughters, both of whom are dead, leaving no children. He married for his second wife, Mrs. Tryphena Richardson. She survived him. By patient industry and frugality he accumulated a property.

The oldest sister of my-father was Sally Maria, born in Jaffrey the 16th of April, 1810; married Vryling D. Shattuck. They had four children, three of whom are still living. Mrs. Vryling D. Shattuck died in Jaffrey, Sept. 2, 1896, at the advanced age of eighty-five.

The second sister was Susan Eliza, who was born in Jaffrey the 4th of November, 1812; married Charles J. Fox, April 29, 1838. She went west directly after her marriage, crossed the state of New York on a canal boat, and lived at first in a log cabin in Rockton, Ill. She would tell very interesting stories of their early pioneer days and of her encounter with Indians, of whom she was very much afraid, although they were always friendly. She had seven children, four of whom are still living. She died in Boston, Sept. 29, 1894, at the age of eighty-two.

The third sister, Rachel Rebecca, was born April 8, 1815; she married Edmund Parker Shattuck, May 18, 1837. After her mother's death she came home to Jaffrey to care for her father, and still lives on the old place, which has been changed into quite a modern boarding-house, and in summer is filled with city boarders and called "Shattuck Farm." Her husband and herself are both living at the advanced age of more than "three-score and ten." They had seven children, four of whom are now living. On May 16, 1897, they celebrated the 60th anniversary of their marriage. She cut and made the dress she wore at that time.

The fourth sister, Abigail Jones, born in Jaffrey, August 4, 1817, married in Rockton (where she was with her sister, Mrs. Fox) Benjamin Franklin Fletcher, June 15, 1847. She had a daughter whom she buried at the age of twenty-four. She is now a widow and lives in Jaffrey with her relatives. She is very industrious, and her mind is wonderfully bright and retentive. She celebrated her seventy-eighth birthday by cutting out a dress for herself.

The fifth sister, Lucy Sylvania, is the only one of the sisters who did not attain to three-score years. She was born the 17th of November, 1819; she married Elisha Brooks Barrett, May 19, 1842, and died in Mason, N. H., of consumption, Feb. 23, 1856. She left one son, but he has since died of consumption, leaving a widow and son, who reside in Framingham.

Came from England, A. D. 1640,

Died Jan. 10, 1663 or 1664.

William													
Richard { m. 1644, Elizabeth, surname unknown, died 1661. 1621-1693 { m. 1662, Frances Perriman Ansteden.													
Elizabeth 1645 to 1658	Samuel 1647-?	Thomas 1648-1690	William 1650-1723	Ephraim 1651-?	Gershom 1653-1738	Mary 1657-1735	Nathaniel 1663-?	Rebecca 1665-1741	Hephzibah 1667-1668	Elizabeth 1668-1742	Hephzibah 1671-1745	Sarah 1673-?	Ruthamah 1678-1756
Ephraim 1680-1737	Jonathan 1685-1702	Bethia 1686-?	Mary 1689-1697	Hannah 1690-?	Abigail 1693-1702	George 1700-1747							
Rachel 1724-1799	John 1726-1771	Jonathan 1728-1755	David 1730-1760	Nathan 1733-1778	Abigail 1735-?	Benjamin 1738-1740	Elizabeth 1741-1787	Benjamin 1744-1821					
John 1750-1812	Joseph 1752-1840	Moses 1754-1756	Benjamin 1756-1833	Susanna 1759-1815	Moses 1760-1816	David 1762-1826	Rachel 1764-1768	Sarah 1767-1852	Rachel 1769-1863	Benoni 1771-1816			
Joseph 1777-1860	Rachel 1779-1825	John 1780-1857	Susan 1782-1826	Daniel 1784-1868	Sabra 1785-1843	Nehemiah 1787-1859	(list 1790-1838	Abel 1793-1878	Joel 1793-1871				
Daniel Bateman 1808-1890	Sally Maria 1810-1896	Susan Eliza 1812-1894	Rachel Rebecca 1815-	Abigail Jones 1817-	Lacy Sylvia 1819-1856	Edward Stearns 1822-	Leonard Richardson 1825-1894	Isaac Jones 1830-					

The second son, Edward Stearns, born at Jaffrey the 27th of March, 1822, married May 21, 1850, Janette, daughter of Samuel and Janet (Steele) Swan of Peterboro, N. H. She died Sept. 14, 1873. He married second Sarah A. Lord of Maine. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1844, began to practise law at Peterboro in 1849, has since practised in Amherst, N. H., and Boston, Mass., and is at present practising with his son, H. A. Cutter, in Nashua, N. H. By his first wife he had four children, three of whom are living.

The third son was Leonard Richardson, the subject of this Memorial. He was born in Jaffrey, July 1, 1825, married Mercy Taylor of Boston, daughter of Phineas and Mercy (Fairbanks) Taylor of Harvard, Mass., April 15, 1852; she died Jan. 27, 1894. He died July 13, 1894. They left two daughters, one of whom is living.

The fourth son and the baby of the family was Isaac Jones, born in Jaffrey the 30th of May, 1830, married Sept. 9, 1858, Margarette, daughter of Joseph and Rispah (Farmer) Wood of Concord, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1852, studied law, and opened a law office in Boston in 1856, and continues to practise in that city. He has two children residing in Concord, Mass.

Such is the history of this typical New England family, every branch of it dating back to English emigrants who came here in the early days of the colonies and who worked hard to earn for themselves and families adequate support. They did with their might whatever their hands found to do, and they with others like-minded, founded for us this present New England, and our heartfelt thanks are due to them for the delights, comforts and enjoyments of our dear New England homes.

CHAPTER II.

CHILDHOOD AND SCHOOL LIFE.

The account of my father's childhood days cannot be better or more accurately given than by copying a letter which my uncle, Edward S. Cutter of Nashua, N. H., has kindly written to me. He was only three years my father's senior, and although three-score and ten years have been given him, his early recollections are most clear. Before quoting his letter I will mention that father's name—Leonard Richardson—was given to him in memory of some minister, a friend of his mother.

My uncle writes: "Your father was born on Friday, the first day of July, 1825, and although I was but a few months over three years of age at that time, I can recollect the event very distinctly.

"Two little incidents occurred at that time which served to fix the event in my memory indelibly. First, I recollect being hustled away one night, rather unceremoniously, with my sisters, to Uncle Joel's to spend the night, when mother was first taken sick, and that I made a great fuss about it and dare say set up a tremendous howl, as I did not understand the occasion for any such extraordinary performance.

"Second, I recollect that some days afterwards, while returning home from school with my two sisters, Abby and Lucy, one afternoon, I got into a great confab with sister Lucy as to who should have the baby for a playmate, she claiming he would be her playmate, and I claiming, with a good deal of emphasis, that he should be my playmate, and the contention waxed so earnest I went into tears over it, and sister Abby came forward and settled the question by saying he would be the playmate of both of us, which seemed to be perfectly satisfactory to both parties. This little event made so deep an impression on my mind at the time that I never forgot it, and even now at this late day I can go and point out the place where it happened.

"Of course I was very much pleased with my little baby brother and very careful of him, as were also all my sisters, and as he grew up toward manhood, he was ever afterward, till I left home for college, my most intimate companion, playmate, schoolmate, roommate, bedfellow and workfellow. We were together more than most brothers are, especially



BIRTH PLACE, JAFFREY, N. H.
JULY 1, 1825.

those whose parents live in a city or village where there are many other boys to associate with. Where one went, the other went,—going to school together, out fishing in the mountain brooks together, going to the military trainings and musters together, and working together on father's farm. And I can say with truth what I think speaks well for both of us, that intimate as we were and together as much as we were, I cannot recollect of ever having any falling-out or quarrel with him during all that time, upon any subject or upon any occasion. We lived a very busy life on the farm in our youthful days, and formed habits of industry which always stood by us ever afterwards, as you very well know in regard to your father; and the outdoor work, breathing the fresh, pure mountain air, gave us good health and a robust physical constitution.

“Father was a strict disciplinarian, and having a very large farm with a plenty of work to do, he was disposed to keep us pretty constantly at work, as soon as we were old enough, except when we were attending the district school. We had but few holidays compared with other boys of our age at that time generally. We had Fast Day in early April, May Training on the second Tuesday in May, Election Day on the first Wednesday in June, the Fourth of July, Muster Day in September, and Thanksgiving Day in the latter part of November. These were all the holidays regularly allowed us during the year, although Fast Day or Thanksgiving Day could hardly be called a holiday, but rather a Holy Day, as we were not allowed to engage in sports or games on either of those days until after sunset.

“We were allowed occasionally a day during the summer to go a-fishing, when the weather was lowering; but we rarely or never went a-hunting, as it was not congenial to either of us to kill small birds or squirrels, and there was not much large game to hunt.

“Our boyhood life on the farm from year to year was very similar, but not monotonous. We attended the common district school in the winter during the months of December and January and a part of February, in all about ten weeks. After the close of school in February, we went to work with father chopping and splitting firewood in the dooryard near the house, a cold, bleak place to work in at that season of the year, exposed as we were to the northwest wind coming down from Mt. Monadnock, which compelled us to work pretty vigorously to keep from freezing. We were always glad when we had finished that work, which usually lasted till about the tenth of March, when we went with father into the

woods to engage in making maple sugar; tapping the rock-maple trees, putting buckets under the spouts, gathering the sap morning and evening into barrels placed upon ox-sleds and drawn to a shed near our house, where the sap was boiled into syrup and afterwards made into sugar. This kept us at work till about the first of April, when we went with father into the mountain pastures to repair the fences, to keep the sheep and cattle from straying away during the summer season. This occupied about two weeks' time. Father used to keep in his mountain pastures about one hundred head of cattle, about three hundred sheep, and a few colts and horses. After mending the fences we usually went into the fields to plough and prepare the ground for planting and sowing grain. The planting season lasted till about the middle of May.

"About the tenth of May every year we went with father to Bedford, Mass., mother's native town, about fifty miles from Jaffrey, and collected about one hundred head of cattle from the farmers of Bedford and vicinity and drove them to Jaffrey and put them in his mountain pastures, and there kept them till about the tenth of October, when we drove them back to Bedford and delivered them to their owners. These two trips to Bedford, one in the spring and the other in the autumn, afforded us a great deal of pleasure. For weeks before we looked forward to them with ardent anticipations, although these trips were attended with considerable hard, disagreeable work; rising early in the morning as soon as it was light or earlier, collecting the cattle and driving them along the dusty highway for two days was very tiresome and in many respects disagreeable, yet they afforded us an outing twice a year and a change from the routine of farm life, taking us into the world outside the farm, introducing us to new surroundings and new people; and we enjoyed it hugely.

"After getting the cattle into the mountain pastures and finishing the planting, then came on the washing and the shearing of the sheep, which took about two weeks, and after that till the first of July we were engaged with father in hoeing and weeding the corn and potato fields.

"The first Monday after the Fourth of July of every year father usually commenced haying, as it was termed, that is, cutting the grass in the fields, making it into hay and storing it in the barns. This was the busiest season of the year and usually lasted about six weeks. But your father and I were both very fond of it, as the pleasantest work on the farm of the whole year,—it was so neat and clean and the fields were so fresh and green and beautiful with wild flowers, and the new-mown

hay so fragrant. Until we were about eight years old, we attended the district summer school eight or nine weeks, beginning about the twentieth of May, every year.

"After finishing haying in August, father commenced harvesting his English grain crops, such as wheat, barley, oats and rye, which occupied about two weeks, and when that work was finished, father and mother usually took a trip to Mason, N. H., or Bedford, Mass., to visit mother's sisters and other relatives and friends, and were generally absent about two weeks.

"During their absence your father and I had a stint assigned us for each day's work by father, in gathering together in piles the small surface stones in the fields where the grain had just been harvested. We were to pick up a certain number of piles of stones, including in each pile a certain amount of land. We usually began very early in the morning and worked rapidly so as to finish our 'stint' in the forenoon, and had the afternoon for amusements.

"On his return from his journey, father commenced his fall harvesting, gathering in his corn into his barns, digging his potatoes and putting them into his cellars, gathering in his apples, and making cider of the second quality and putting the best quality into his cellar, and, in general, finishing up the year's work on the farm with a Thanksgiving Day in the latter part of November.

"Such was the annual routine of work in our boyhood days upon the farm, not wholly monotonous, but diversified from year to year by special incidents which gave variety to our lives. And now, in my old age, I look back upon those years of toil with a thrill of pleasure, and I delight in going back to those old fields and pastures and recalling the events that occurred there.

"There are many little incidents which occurred in those days, which your father used to relate with a good deal of glee, notably his capture of the August sweet apple in the month of August, 1836. The facts are as follows: On the day when that event happened, father went up to a farm he owned on the side of Monadnock mountain, called the Mead's farm, to finish haying there, taking with him his oxen and a hay-cart to bring home a load of hay, and we went with him. The Mead's farm was an abandoned farm, where a family once lived by the name of Mead. I can recollect the family when they lived there. When the Mead's family left it, father bought it and owned it many years, and used to get hay and

apples from it, and used the pastures for pasturing cattle which he got from Bedford, Mass., and vicinity.

"In going up to the Mead's farm at the time referred to, we had to go through the old farm, where we children were all born, then owned by Ira Hastings, who had married our cousin, Rebecca Cutter, daughter of Uncle John Cutter. As we went up that day, your father and I looked for the August sweet-apple tree, to see if it had any ripe apples on it, knowing the tree well and the luscious quality of the apples. We saw hanging upon the tree a large, beautiful, ripe, yellow apple, a great temptation to us boys, too great for us to resist, and we resolved to capture it on our return. And so on our return, following along behind the load of hay, as father drove the team down the hill through the orchard ahead of us, we took the opportunity without his knowing it to run round among the apple trees, out of sight of the house, so cousin Rebecca would not see us, and up to the August sweet tree, and I, being the elder, outran your father and got there first, and sprang into the tree to shake off the golden apple, but he on coming up stooped down and pulling off one of his heavy farm shoes, threw it up into the tree and brought the apple down, and thrusting his foot into his shoe, seized the apple and ran off with it down to the load of hay, leaving me to get down from the tree as best I could and follow after.

"At that moment, and this is what pleased your father most, cousin Rebecca had by chance seen us at her apple tree and came rushing out of the house and scolded me very vigorously. Of course I had nothing to say in defence, and could only run away as fast as my legs could carry me. When I came up to the load of hay, I found your father laughing most heartily, that he had *got the apple* and I had *got the scolding*, and ever afterwards he used to enjoy relating the anecdote to his friends hugely. But if I happened to be present at such times, I used to put a damper on the merriment by asking your father the question if he knew 'who ate that apple,' which he was obliged to answer in the negative. For he so enjoyed the sight of the beautiful golden apple that he did not eat it at once, but carried it home with him, occasionally holding it out to me and saying, 'Don't you wish you had that apple?' On reaching home he carefully stowed it away, as we went with father to the barn to unload the hay, but on his return to the house he could not find the apple. It had disappeared from the place where he had left it. I do not think your father ever knew who ate the apple, although he might have had his suspicions, for as 'the partaker is as bad as the thief,' whoever did eat the

apple kept the secret in his own bosom. Father gave us both a good scolding when he found out we had robbed cousin Rebecca's apple tree, and said we deserved a flogging for doing it. But in those days when apples were so plenty and of so little value, it was not considered stealing if one, when going through another man's orchard, should pick up an apple and eat it or take one from the tree.

"Another event in your father's early life occurs to my mind. You recollect your father had the middle finger on one of his hands, I think the right hand, scarred at the end of it as if bruised and flattened. I can well remember how it happened. We were visiting Uncle Joel's boys one day in the summer, I should say in 1830, and were out at play in the field east of the house, building a chimney of small stones upon a large rock there in the field, and as we boys each one of us brought stones and piled them upon the rock to make the chimney, cousin Frederick accidentally let drop a stone, which happened to fall on your father's finger, crushing it. I recollect now how it looked at the time; first a mass of bruised flesh and then the blood oozing out of it. I was a good deal alarmed, and caught hold of your father's arm and led him to the house, and Aunt Mary bound it up as best she could, and I then went home with him, and father took him to Dr. Luke Howe, who was our family physician. I recollect father said on his return that Dr. Howe advised at once to have the finger cut off, but father objected, and Dr. Howe bound it up as well as he could with plasters to save the finger if possible. His finger was quite painful and troublesome for some weeks, but finally it healed up and became nearly or quite as serviceable as though it had not been injured—only a little deformed, as you well remember.

"Another event in your father's early life, remarkable chiefly for its effect upon him afterwards, I well remember. We boys, while living at home on the old farm where we were born, growing up to manhood, were both of us very fond of cucumbers, pared and sliced in vinegar, and eaten with pepper and salt. But mother always kept us constantly in check, fearing we should eat so much of the cucumbers as to make us sick. She would say again and again: 'Boys, you *must not* eat so many cucumbers; they will make you sick.' But one time when returning from the Thorndike Pond at early twilight, where we had been for a swim, we came across a bed of cucumber vines in a neighbor's field, heavily loaded with cucumbers. The sight was a tempting one, and we thought we would take what we could conveniently carry home with us, and for once in our lives have all the cucumbers we could eat, and as there were so many on

the vines, the owner would not miss them, and in truth did not need them. So we gathered up a lot of the cucumbers and carried them home with us, getting home a little after dark, and concealed them till father and mother and the rest of the family had all gone to bed for the night. We then each of us got a quart bowl and pared and sliced cucumbers enough to fill our bowls, poured on vinegar and put on salt and pepper and took our bowls upstairs into our bedroom, and there sat down and ate a bowl full apiece and went to bed, at first feeling no inconvenience from such a hearty supper. About midnight your father waked me up, complaining of being sick at his stomach. I got up and acted as nurse, and he disposed of the cucumbers he had eaten and immediately felt relieved, and went to bed again and slept well and got up in the morning as well as ever, but could never afterwards eat any cucumbers, as I have been informed. As our bedchamber was at considerable distance from father and mother's bedroom and entirely separate from the chambers where our sisters slept, we did not disturb any member of the family, and none of them knew anything about our forage freak till a long time afterwards. I have no recollection of experiencing any inconvenience whatever from the rash act, and must have had a stomach like an ostrich.

"Among the many anecdotes your father enjoyed relating of events occurring in his early life, I think no one amused him more than that of our attempt at one time to induce father to buy us a gun to hunt game with. At the time in question, say about 1834, the foxes were making great havoc among the young lambs, and the crows were destroying the corn in the fields, and your father and I thought it would be a good time to try to induce father to buy us a hunting gun, which we had long wanted to get, as we had no gun except an old firelock which had done good service in the war of the Revolution, but was so much worn out that the only way to fire it off was to touch it off with a live coal of fire. But father and mother were both very much opposed to our getting another gun, fearing we might meet with some accident. At the time in question the foxes and the crows had become so bold in their depredations we thought father would waive all objections to our having another gun, considering how useful it might be in protecting the lambs from the foxes and the cornfields from the crows. And at this time Samuel Cutter, a cousin of ours, a near neighbor, had fitted up a gun by taking an old gun barrel and fitting to it a new stock and lock, and offered to sell it to us very cheap. We were much pleased with it, and with the idea of going out into the woods and shooting the foxes and the crows. So one

day we got the gun from our cousin and concealed it in some bushes near the cornfield where we were going to do some hoeing the next day. Our plan was to go into the field the next morning with father and work so smartly as to put father in a very pleasant mood and then exhibit the gun to him and ask him to buy it. I was to help do the hoeing and your father pull up the weeds; and so when we had got father into a very pleasant state of mind, as we thought, I stepped out of the field and brought forward the gun and stated our wishes in regard to it. But father, instead of listening to our proposition, would not entertain it for a moment, and ordered me *peremptorily* to return the gun to the owner forthwith and then come back and go to work, which I did without delay. But your father and I did not work quite *so lively* the rest of the day—were not quite so sociable, and felt, as Rufus Choate would have expressed it, a good deal ‘flabbergasted.’ But, on the whole, we were thankful that we had escaped a flogging, for father had lost all patience with us teasing for a gun, and was utterly disgusted with the patched-up *concern* we had asked him to buy for us.

“Your father was always a faithful, reliable and industrious boy, large and strong of his age, and he and I, while we lived at home with father, did a great amount of work on the farm, beginning when quite young and working very constantly.

“Your father was a school teacher two winter seasons, as I recollect, once in Jaffrey at the north part of the town, I think in the winter of 1843-44, and once in Temple, at the Centre School district, in 1844-45, being the same school I had taught the winter previous. He had the reputation of being an excellent teacher, thorough-going and methodical, and met with good success.

“Your father’s boyhood days, I think, were spent by him very pleasantly, although attended with abundant labor. His school days and the few holidays he had were enjoyed by him supremely from the relaxation and change thus afforded from the hard labor on the farm, and in after life he looked back upon the events of his childhood with great delight and amusement.

“Of the holidays allowed us by father while we lived upon the farm the one we enjoyed the most and looked forward to with the most ardent expectations of pleasure was the annual muster of the 12th Regiment of the New Hampshire militia. It was held at Troy, a small town about seven miles southwest from Jaffrey. In going to Troy we had to pass over the high ridge connecting the Monadnock mountain with Gap

mountain, as it was called. The muster was held about the middle of September every year, and the 12th Regiment was made up from eight towns, viz., Jaffrey, Rindge, Fitzwilliam, Troy, Marlborough, Roxbury, Nelson and Dublin, and consisted of eight companies of infantry, not dressed in uniform, and two rifle companies, two companies of cavalry, one artillery company, one company of grenadiers, and four light infantry companies dressed in uniform, eighteen companies in all. And these companies embraced nearly every able-bodied man in these eight towns between the ages of eighteen and forty-five. Hence these musters brought together every year nearly all the active young business men in these towns, most of them as members of these military companies. All the inhabitants took great interest in the muster, the boys especially, and large numbers came to see the sights and listen to the martial music of the brass bands connected with the military companies.

"For days beforehand your father and I, while at work in the field and after retiring to bed at night, used to talk about the coming muster, and so much interested would we become that the night before the muster we could scarcely sleep and would get up several times during the night and look out to see what the prospect was for fair weather, and in the morning had no appetite for breakfast. Father would rise very early, about four o'clock in the morning of the day of the muster, and having taken a hasty breakfast and harnessed the horse into the wagon, we would start for Troy, so as to get there in season to hear the morning gun fired by the Fitzwilliam Artillery at sunrise. The drive was usually a very delightful one over the mountain road thus early in the morning on a fine September day, when the weather was mild and balmy, and when we had passed over the mountain ridge between Jaffrey and Troy, and heard the booming of the cannon at sunrise, as it echoed along the sides of the mountain, and soon after heard the strains of martial music as they reached our ears from the military companies on the muster field, our hearts were fired with enthusiasm and we were impatient to get on to the muster field as soon as possible and enjoy the sights.

"Father always gave us a little spending money for muster, and no sooner had we got on to the field than we proceeded immediately to invest a part of our funds in two sheets of gingerbread, one for each of us. We called them sheets and not cakes from their peculiar oblong rectangular shape, and no gingerbread ever tasted half so sweet and good as the gingerbread we bought on the muster field. Not having eaten much, if any, breakfast that morning, our mountain ride had given us a



SITE OF BIRTH-PLACE AND THE OLD OAK.

pretty sharp appetite, and we proceeded to dispose of the gingerbread with a relish. And then for the sights! The whole day through was one round of enjoyment. The tents of the military, the waving of flags, the marching of the military companies with martial music, the carriages of hucksters and pedlers vending their goods of various kinds, the booths for the sale of various kinds of food, drink and sweetmeats, and in the midst of all the 'liberty pole' with the stars and stripes high waving in the air, all furnished a grand spectacle for us farmer boys. First in the morning the several military companies, especially such as were dressed in uniform, marched and countermarched and manœuvred, each by itself, with their bands playing martial music; afterwards came the inspection of each company by the inspector-general and his staff, then the dress parade of the whole regiment, and after that the passing in review of the regiment before the major-general and his staff, and later on, at the close of the day, came the 'sham fight,' the climax of the muster in our eyes. The regiment was divided into two armies, each having a rifle company and a company of cavalry, all drawn up on the one side and the other in battle array. Then came the attack, the firing of guns with blank cartridges, the rattle of musketry, the booming of cannon, and all the various manœuvring of armies in battle, and a final surrender of one side to the other. This concluded the military exercises of the day and the military companies were disbanded; the crowd of spectators dispersed, and everybody went home satisfied with the day's enjoyment. Father took us boys to the stable where he had kept his horse during the day and drove back over the mountain road to Jaffrey. We had 'taken in' the muster and got safely home, tired and weary with so much exercise and sightseeing in one day. But we retired to bed early and slept soundly, as only children can sleep, and waked up the next morning to talk over the events of the day previous; and for days and weeks after, the muster with all its incidents was the theme of conversation with us, and in going to and from the work field we would whistle as well as we could some of the strains of martial music we had heard played by the bands at the muster.

"I will venture the assertion that at the present day no holiday, no agricultural fair, no brigade muster and no gathering of the people of any kind furnishes so much pleasure of so great variety to the country people as did those old-fashioned musters."

My father worked hard at his studies. He did not learn as easily as some, but he was very persevering and faithful. When he

would break a wish-bone, he used to wish he could do all the sums in Adams's Arithmetic. His parents wished very much that he should go through Dartmouth College, as his brothers did, and he commenced studying Greek and Latin, but his mind was more mathematical and he did not take easily to the languages, and I have heard him say that he made up his mind that life was too short to spend so much time on "dead languages." He was always very fond of games; in late years it was cards, checkers and backgammon, but at home in his boyhood he and his younger brother used to like to play "fox and geese"; but there was not any time in the family given for such things. They were obliged to retire early in order to rise early. In the room that father and his brother occupied there was a large closet. The boys manufactured a "fox and geese" board, and after going up to bed they would take their candle and board into the closet to play. One night they forgot themselves in the game, were overheard, and their mother came in and took their board away, and their games were finished for a while.

My father's first business adventure was in lambs. When he was quite young his father gave him a lamb that he had been instrumental in saving, having found it in the mountain pasture deserted by its mother, and he brought it home and took care of it. His father paid him for the wool, and in time he had quite a little flock. He always showed a fondness for business, even when a child, and his talent in that direction was especially marked. They used to cut flags and sell them to the chair-seaters for spending money. Father early showed a fondness for nature; animals and birds of all kinds appealed to him. He had a pet crow, of which he was very fond. He enjoyed hunting as a sport, but never cared to shoot the song-birds. He would trap a great many of the animals which are such enemies of the farmer. He delighted to tell of the shooting of a number of crows at once. He imitated an owl and got them together in one tree, then he fired away at them.

One of the early influences which showed itself all through father's life was the keeping of the Sabbath. His mother was a member of the Congregational church, his father, although not a professor, was a strict Sabbath keeper and faithful church attendant. My uncle tells me the only whipping with a rod that he remembers, was administered to him by his father for playing tag on the Sabbath. In these early days the family arose as usual on Sabbath morning, did the necessary work indoors and at the barn and then prepared for church. There were so many to go that every Sunday some of the children were obliged to stay at home.

There were two preaching services and Sabbath school between. After the family came home and dinner had been served and cleared away, the catechism was taught the children by their mother, together with the Bible.

On the Sabbath, when it was the turn of the three youngest boys to remain at home, they had little amusements of their own, among which was the baking of custards, about which my uncle has written the following account:

"Mother was, as perhaps you know, a very religious woman, a member of the Congregational church, and very scrupulous about the observance of the Sabbath. And father, although not a church member, was always in favor of his children going to church. But generally some one or more of us were left at home on Sunday to look after the house. And sometimes your father, your Uncle Jones and myself would be left at home for that purpose; and as your father and I were both of us very fond of custards cooked in cups, and could never get quite all we wanted, as mother would keep us in check, lest we should eat so much as to make us sick, I took the opportunity when at home Sunday with your father and Jones to make some custard and bake it in two-pint bowls, one for your father and one for myself. We did not allow brother Jones to partake with us of this delicious repast, as, being the baby of the family, he was quite inclined to tell mother everything that had been done by us in her absence on Sunday. So while I was preparing and baking the custard, your father would entertain Jones outdoors, and when I had got the custards baked—I baked them in a tin baker before the open fire—I would go out and entertain Jones outdoors and your father would come in and eat his custard, and then he would go out and take charge of Jones while I went in and ate my custard and washed the dishes and put things in order. Your father in after times used to hector Jones a good deal by telling him how much he lost by being a telltale, as he called it, and not getting a share of the custards I cooked. He used to say I made the best custard he ever ate, as I made it pretty sweet with maple sugar and was not sparing in using cream, as mother always had an abundance of it."

I will close the chapter by quoting directly from a memorial sketch which the Rev. Moses Runnels of Newport, N. H., has kindly sent me, and which is connected with this part of father's life. Mr. Runnels writes:

"My acquaintance with the late Hon. Leonard R. Cutter of Boston,

Mass., is indelibly and most delightfully connected with four distinct periods of our common lives, which as so many separate and faithful 'pictures from memory' I will here try to reproduce.

I.

"In 1835, when as a child of five summers I was led to 'meeting' in the old brick sanctuary at Jaffrey Centre, N. H.,—the only child of my widowed mother,—I used to see Leonard, a noble, robust lad of about ten years, of ruddy complexion, the very picture of health and cheerfulness.

"He came to church attended by his mother and two brothers, frequently also by his father and sisters, the latter of whom were members of the choir.

"Of these brothers, the older graduated at Dartmouth College in 1844, and is the Hon. Edward S. Cutter of Nashua, N. H. The younger, Isaac Jones Cutter, Esq., of Boston, was about my own age, and our first jackets, or boys' suits, that summer were made after exactly the same pattern. He was afterwards my companion in college (D. C., 1852).

"Our family pews were in the same line of 'body slips' in the meeting-house, the Cutters entering by the north aisle, and we by the south, so that our mothers sat next to each other, at the head of their respective pews, Leonard and his brothers at their mother's left hand, and I at my mother's right.

"These mothers thus became great friends, frequently finding occasion to converse together, at intermission, between the morning and afternoon services. But what I chiefly recall, in this connection, is the fact that my good mother was often directing my attention, both during service and afterwards, to Leonard Cutter as a rare example of sedate, orderly and commendable conduct in church, which I, in my nervous restlessness, should do well to follow.

"I know that she always held him in very high esteem as a youth and a young man, and she was wont to predict in my hearing his prospective usefulness and eminent success in life. I have been pleased to learn, in these later years, that this admiration was, to some extent, mutual, and that Mr. Cutter was accustomed to think and speak well of my mother, for which I now bless his memory.

II.

"The second picture on memory's walls transfers us from six to nine years later on, when we find the same child of five and lad of ten attend-

ing school together at the old 'Melville Academy' in Jaffrey Centre, N. H., under the instruction of Messrs. Harry Bricket (D. C., 1840) and Charles Cutter (D. C., 1842).

"Leonard is now a stalwart young man, nearly or quite grown up—hale, athletic, vigorous—with a fine flow of animal spirits. His dress and personal appearance are vividly recalled—as in the fall term of 1841—neatly clad in a bluish frock coat, pants somewhat lighter, spotless linen and cravat, and beautifully fitting gaiter boots. I see him upon that back seat near the window in the upper room, his right knee over the left, and right foot in gentle motion, while intently engaged in study, one of the first instances of intense, all-absorbing application to a text-book that ever impressed me.

"In the winter term, too, of 1843-44, which was the last we attended school together, we were under the faithful guidance of Mr. Charles Cutter in the little upper room of the academy building, the school being small. I recall especially, that winter, his kindness and exuberance of spirits, his vigorous health and abounding cheerfulness and pleasantry. In athletics he was a champion. His cousins, the sons of Mr. Joel Cutter of Jaffrey, of about his own age, were no match for him in physical strength and agility, and that, as we Jaffrey boys all thought, was saying a good deal. We were allowed in stormy weather to make a sort of play-room of the larger academy hall. I remember the expression which fell from his lips one day: 'Well, boys, don't we make this old knowledge box shake!' He was then a brilliant scholar, an adept in mathematics. We all supposed he was intending to study, like his two older brothers, Daniel B. Cutter, M. D., and Edward S. Cutter, Esq., who had both graduated at Dartmouth College, the former in 1833; and we predicted for Leonard even a yet more successful career as a scholar or professional man. But in the course of the winter it was ascertained that his thoughts did not lie in that direction. He seemed rather to have in mind as his models the careers of Hons. Isaac Parker, Marshal P. Wilder and others, who, natives of Jaffrey and vicinity, had gone to Boston and had already become men of wealth and distinction. He used to say he was going to Boston and intended to be a rich man some day, while we, his school-mates, from what we knew of his good principles and strict integrity, his strong will and unflagging perseverance, had no reason to question the probability of a full realization of his hopes and expectations.

"It was the very next season, I believe, that he first went to the city."

CHAPTER III.

EARLY YEARS IN BOSTON.

My father came to Boston in 1845. His cousin, Mr. Parker Cutter, procured a place for him in a grocery store in Roxbury, but father was very discontented. His employer paid very little attention to his business, left father inexperienced and alone a great deal of the time, and he was homesick and returned to Jaffrey. He worked on the farm with his father during the summer, and in the fall another Jaffrey friend, Mr. Samuel Buss, procured a place for him in Boston, corner of Grove and Southac Streets, with Mr. Mann, another grocer; this place was more to his mind. He remained there as clerk until 1850, when he bought the business from his employer and started by himself.

Extracts from some of his letters to his brother Edward will best show his first impressions and experiences in the city. In May, 1846, he writes:

"I have just returned from meeting; went to Winter Street Church, where Lowell Mason leads the singing, which is first-rate; a splendid house it is, too. I wish you were here to go with me; I generally go alone and go where I please. I intend to go to-night to the Tremont Temple and hear Mr. Gough, the great temperance lecturer.

"The Hon. Daniel Webster arrived here a few days since; the mayor and the citizens honored him by meeting him at the Providence Depot. The inauguration of Everett to the presidency of Harvard College took place last Thursday, and a high time they had, I guess, by the publication in the paper, for all the weather was so unfavorable; Webster and Winthrop were there. The young folks and children had a great time on the Common the first of May, chose their queen and danced and frolicked about. I went out there a while in the morning. As respects my business here, I am in the same store I was last winter, but how long I shall stay in it I can't tell. Mr. Mann has advertised his store for sale. His health is poor and he wants to get into the country. How soon he will sell I cannot tell; as soon, I suppose, as he can find some one to buy him out. If I had been in the business longer, I should be tempted to take the shop. There was a man here from Natick wanted a shop and proposed

going into co-ship with me and let Mr. Mann out. I told him I would do no such thing, I would have nothing to do with co-ship, if I were to take the store I would do it on my own responsibility. I have not had experience enough, nor am I old enough to take charge of a store yet, therefore I shall have nothing to do with it; if anyone who takes it wants to employ me by paying me good wages, I will stay. Sometimes I get weary and think I will stay here in the city no longer, but go west or to some other part of the globe, and then again I feel quite contented. Edward, don't you want to go west this summer? I have a good mind to start some of these nights, get to Albany in the morning; cost \$3 only to Albany; say the word and we go."

His wages for the first year were, besides his board and washing, \$8 a month for the first six months and \$10 afterwards. While he was a clerk, the position of sexton of Mt. Vernon Church was offered him at a salary of much more than he was having. He went to his Sunday school teacher for advice, and he told him he was fitted for larger work, and he gave it up, although the salary was quite tempting.

In November, the same year, he writes: "To tell you the truth I have got about sick of tending shop and being a lackey for all kinds of people, Irish, negroes, etc. I tell you this city is growing worse every day; there are now three theatres in operation at the present time, and fashionable saloons have their signs on all corners of the streets to attract and draw the young into the vortex of intemperance, where so many find their end. The evenings being somewhat long now, those who have nothing to do can attend some place of amusement or some lecture every evening. I generally have two evenings a week to go where I please. I am attending the Lowell lectures on geology; they hold two evening in a week and are very interesting. By the way, you wanted to know if I should like to teach school this coming winter. As respects that, let me tell you I have always had a desire to teach winters, for you are not only teaching others, but you learn a great deal yourself, which is a lasting benefit. Tending store in the winter I dislike worse than in the summer, because the evenings are so long. Therefore I have almost concluded to accept a school if I can have one to suit, that is, some village school where I can have good wages and enough to do, so that time will pass lively. I should like if you have got your eye on about such a one to keep it, let me have the refusal of it till I see you. I think I can get off from here this winter and come back in the spring, for I like store tending better than farming."

About this time father purchased an accordion, for he was very fond

of music. His brother Jones in a letter inquired, "Have you got that accordion? Can you play 'Yankee Doodle' yet?"

His mother wrote him during this year: "Father says he wants you should stick close to your business with Mr. Mann. Edward likes Mr. Mann very much, what little he saw of him, and says you were lucky to get such a place."

He seems to have had a desire to learn and study, and the monotony of tending store was rather distasteful. In August, 1847, he writes:

"I sometimes have half a mind to go to school myself this fall and teach in the winter, if I could find a school to suit me and get decent pay. If you hear of such a chance let me know, for I am getting tired of being confined in a grocery store. I sometimes think I will put myself under Uncle Sam's wing and fly to Mexico. I have a grand opportunity to enlist, for Mr. Adams, who used to be one of our customers, went as lieutenant in Company K and has returned and is a recruiting agent in Lowell. He speaks very highly of the country. You read the late history that has come out and judge for yourself,—a chance for speculation, I think. I intend now (if nothing happens more than I know of) to visit the western country next season. Providence permitting, I mean to see something of the world before I die. I should like very much to visit old England if I could afford it. There is where I now board, 30 West Cedar Street, one boarder besides myself; she is an English lady who is visiting this country; she became acquainted with the people that we are boarding with at The Springs. She has been in Canada, and from there came here. I pay, or rather Mr. Mann pays for me, \$3 per week, washing excluded. I like very much; have a front chamber, as good as yours, to myself. As for general news here, it is about the same every day. By the way, we were honored by a short visit from His Excellency Mr. Polk. You probably saw the account published, therefore I will simply say that I saw him when he entered the city and heard him address our mayor."

In December, 1847, he writes: "I was summoned to appear at the municipal court last Monday and did appear and gave them my testimony; it was new business for me, I assure you, though I had been a witness at the police court before. The case was a man taken up for cruelty, beating and torturing a horse on Grove Street. Fined him \$50 and costs. Great business! Fees lawyers, however. A case like that people will notice, but a case like Miller's forging \$100,000 is not worth noticing, or at least when a man comes a game like that he must be termed a gentleman, for nobody but a 'gentleman' could do it, and he is



Daniel B. Cutter,
Age 39.




Mrs. Sallie N. Shattuck,
Age 38.



Mrs. Susan E. Fox,
Age 39.



Mrs. Rachel R. Shattuck,
Age 34.



Mrs. Abbie J. Fletcher,
Age 34.



Mrs. and Mr. Daniel Cutter,
Age 65.



Mrs. Lucy M. Barrett,
Age 28.




Edward S. Cutter,
Age 26.



Leonard R. Cutter,
Age 22.



Isaac J. Cutter,
Age 24.



Birth-place of
the family.

CUTTER FAMILY.

entitled to a great dinner, etc. But let you or I forge fifty cents, and see what kind of a turkey leg we should gnaw. I think I should have the pleasure of doing it in Leverett Street jail. The grand jurors have had his case before them, but have not indicted him as yet. The Hon. Pal-fry's vote in Congress has agitated the community some, as you have noticed, I presume. I wouldn't wonder if there was a great dinner ready for him on his return. You stated in your letter that you were in your same old chamber where I was so much delighted with the sweet notes of those little birds in the adjoining grove. I was glad to hear that you were getting along so well, that you were in good health; that I consider the greatest blessing. I have been well blessed since I have been here with that. Without that I could do nothing; and may I always take care of myself. And now about business. I remain as yet with the same Mr. Mann, in the same old shop. As for getting rich, it is out of the question; enough to eat and drink and wear is all I expect. Curse your almighty dollar! It will land you in hell at last, and no happiness therefrom. You wished to know my opinion in relation to Jones going to college. I think, as I said when home, if I were in his place and wanted to go, I would go. I should go if I was in his place. I am sorry I did not go; however, I must make the best of it now. You must not get discouraged. Persevere and you will go it and no mistake. Every child has to creep before he can go alone. As respects father's affairs, don't tell about his infirmities until you and I can hoe a row with him, for he is a coon at that, you know."

About this time my father became acquainted with my mother. She with an older and younger sister was keeping house on Charles Street and working for a city tailor, Mr. Calrow. They sewed at their rooms on men's clothes sent from the shop. They traded with Mr. Mann when father was clerk, and he went there for their orders. Their mother died when they were quite young, and their father marrying again, they came to Boston, under the care of their older brother, who was married and lived in Brighton, to earn their living. They had another brother living at Cambridgeport. Mr. Mann, who was a widower, married the oldest sister, Miss Elizabeth Taylor, about this time, and father went to board with Mr. Mann after that, and four years later married the second sister, Miss Mercy Taylor.

In a letter to his brother, dated Feb. 7, 1848, I find the first allusion to mother. He writes: "I have been to meeting this forenoon and have promised to accompany a lady to the Port, as we say, that is, to Cam-

bridge, and as the bells are ringing and I intend to go to meeting there, therefore I must lay this aside for the present, as you know promises must be fulfilled. I am now boarding at No. 2 Zone Street, leading from Grove Street, with my employer, Mr. Mann. He has been married since you saw him. Was married last December. I came here the first of January, 1848, to board, came from Cedar Street, where I liked very well, but I like here better. I tell you I have got a first-rate chamber all to myself, carpeted, etc. I have got me an alarm clock whereby I can rise in the morning at any time I wish, to read the morning news before anybody else. They give me all the pay I ask, with the privilege of doing just as I would at my mother's home."

In a letter dated September, 1848, I find:

"Politics seem to attract no small attention here nowadays, but soon will be ended, I suppose. As regards the Free Soil party, they seem to bluster and throw out some considerable gas, but guess it will amount to but little, though some seem to be unwilling to go for old Zach; it seems rather a bitter pill, though not so bitter in my opinion as to vote for an old whitewashed loco-foco. We have spirited meetings here of all parties. I attend when I can. I think it nonsense to make a separate party in state affairs. However, let them sweat, and we will see how they will come out; they stand in their own light, in my opinion. I think that the platform that old Van has erected is not safe to rest over night upon, especially in his arms. And now, Ned, to tell you the truth, I should like to have a vacation from city trade this winter, and would take a school if I could get one of some notice. Think I should receive some benefit by so doing. If you should learn of a decent chance, let me know, please. I have been here now three years and twenty-five days and have got somewhat tired. Business is dull here now, and I can't have the face to make the proposition to increase my wages at the end of this year, and think he is now paying me more than he can afford. We have a grocery on the opposite side, which injures him some. They sell liquor. As regards buying him out, I don't know. The grocers are selling out all around us; the profits are small."

In a letter dated December 10, 1848:

"In compliance with your wish, I enclose a five-dollar bill, as it is all the loose change I can scrape together at this time. I should have liked it if I could send you ten instead of five. I had (by good rights, I suppose) better look at my own poverty, if ragged clothes are a criterion, but, however, I will wear them a little longer and spare the V. My circum-

stances in relation to money, I think I told you, when at Lucy's, that I was smock up, as the darky said. And now a word about my health. I have not got the cholera, for that is in New York, but I have got a bad sore throat, properly speaking your complaint, not mine, for I never had it before. I didn't go to the shop Friday to do any business, but Saturday stuck to it all day; it is on the gain, I think. Well every other way but that."

About this time father must have been progressing in the matrimonial line, and I find this extract in one of his mother's letters written to him in 1849:

"P—— said you were doing well, if you did not get married. Do not get married, I beg of you, now you can go where you please and no one to pull back. Some men want a wife to make butter and cheese, but you do not. When you get one, be sure and get one that will try to make you prosper and not pull back. I do not ask you to get any better one than your sisters make."

Father's location in Boston made it possible for him to be of great assistance to his family, and letters show how he sold the cattle and oxen for his parents, raised money when it was needed, and did all kinds of errands too numerous to mention. In the summer of 1850, at the request of his parents, who were troubled in procuring help, he went home and helped at haying. From some letters written to my mother during the summer, I find his interest in her very great, and he also writes a little about his haying experiences. He writes, July 14, 1850:

"The next day I commenced haying; kept at it ever since. The sun has burnt me some, and the first and second nights I felt somewhat stiff and lame, but now I feel very well. We have made and got in seven loads of hay and got one out in bunches. I worked alone the first two days. Father had not finished his hoeing. We received a letter from Jones last Thursday, stating, in reference to being at home, what he did in mine. I shall be glad to see him, for our team is rather too small. It has been good hay weather till to-day it rains some. The two first days I had no one to talk to but the bees, and one of them stung me. I killed a tremendous great adder."

July 28 he writes to mother:

"The next week we could do but little at haying, as the weather was bad. Friday and Saturday it rained all day, so I had a grand time to rest. On Friday I lay down at 6 A. M. and dropped asleep and did not wake until 2 P. M. Was not that a nap? It beat my Sunday naps down there. For

the last week the weather has been very favorable, and we have made lots of hay. Father went to Troy Friday and brought Jones home, so we had him to help us yesterday. I am glad he has got home, for we shall proceed faster now, if the weather is good. It is no hay day to-day, but Sunday we care very little for the weather, as we are too apostolic to violate the day. We have all been well since I wrote. I have got very badly tanned. I received this eve. one paper from Mr. Mann, I suppose by the handwriting, and have received two before this, and this week have received three from you, for which I feel very grateful. Please extend thanks to him also. I have a grand feast when I find them at the post office, I assure you. I perceive that Prof. Webster's fate is now sealed. I am sorry, but hope it is all for the best."

It was during this year that the exciting Webster-Parkman murder occurred at the medical school, which was located at the lower part of Grove Street where father's business was. I have heard him describe the crowds that collected there and the intense excitement which attended it. Jenny Lind also sang in Boston about this time, but father didn't feel that he could afford to go to such expensive entertainments. At this time father spent between five and six weeks at Jaffrey with his parents.

In 1849 a little daughter was born to Mr. and Mrs. Mann where he boarded, and the fondness he showed for that little one was remarkable. He loved to stay at home Sundays and care for her. He taught her all her letters, and one of the first things she learned to speak was "Mitter Tutter," as she called him. The affection for her continued through her life. After he had two little daughters of his own and when she died at the age of thirteen, with the death notice in the paper, which he was commissioned to put in, appeared the following verse:

"We loved her, yes, no tongue can tell
How much we loved her and how well;
God loved her, too, and thought it best
To take her home to be at rest."

He never said where he found it or whether he put it in, but it showed in a very simple way the depth and tenderness of his sympathetic nature.

In 1851 he purchased the business from Mr. Mann and became proprietor of the store. Mr. Mann took pains to give him a good start and introduced him to all the firms from whom he was purchasing goods, and from the very first father was trusted without hesitation. Honesty seemed to shine in his face; there was no deceit about him.

On Dec. 28, 1851, he wrote to his brother Edward, not to get him any school as heretofore, but thus:

"I have a little matter in which you can perhaps assist me a little. It is to get me a good, honest clerk, one whose scholarship is good and quick at figures. I thought perhaps you might hear of a good boy in your town or about there whom you could recommend. As for wages, I want to get one as cheap as I can, but still I am willing to pay a fair price. I will see to his boarding place. I cannot state any price that I would give; it will depend altogether how much good he does me. I am willing to give as much as any one in my line of business. If he has not been in the business before, he will have a chance to learn it. I can get a plenty of boys here, but I don't want them. I want some one that I can depend on and whom I am not afraid to trust, if such a one can be found. Mr. Knight talks of going up to Jaffrey to visit his uncle, and then is the time I would like to get a live one to come. I would like to have you notice this wish immediately and return me an answer. I am getting somewhat settled and find my new shop much more handy than the old one. How is the weather up where you are? It has been the coldest December that I ever saw in Boston."

In a letter from his mother dated Feb. 22, 1851, is the following: "You wrote me you were going into business by yourself. I feel afraid you will not make so much as you would if you lived with some one and had wages; you will meet with losses and disappointments that you would not if you lived as you have done. I suppose you want to be your own master; we know that it is more pleasant. I hope you will be careful and look well to your business. I presume you will and not do anything that will hurt your credit or your character. I hope you will come and see us often. I wish you well with all my heart."

In the spring of 1852 my father married Mercy Taylor, daughter of Phineas and Mercy Fairbanks Taylor. She was born in Harvard, July 27, 1824, and was one of a family of nine. Her mother died when she was quite young. Her father married again, but his wife did not long survive him, and he went to central New York and lived a number of years with a sister of his and his two younger daughters. My mother with her sisters lived together in Boston. Her wedding took place at her brother's, Mr. Jacob F. Taylor, in Brighton.

Before closing this period of father's life, I must relate the circumstances attending the possession of his first watch. While he was clerk in Mr. Mann's store, a man came in one day and told him a nice English

watch was to be sold at a lottery on Cambridge Street. The tickets were only one dollar apiece, but father said no, he didn't want any, that his mother told him when he came to the city to beware of theatres and lotteries. The man persisted and finally asked him if he would be one of four to pay twenty-five cents and so purchase one ticket between them and then draw and see whose ticket it should be; to this father rather reluctantly consented, to get rid of the man. Strange as it may seem, father drew the ticket and then the ticket drew the watch, and father carried it up to Jaffrey when he went, and delighted to show around a watch that cost him only twenty-five cents. This, of course, was his luck, but where his judgment shows itself is that he never tried the same thing again. He was not whirled into the vortex of gambling as so many are by their first good fortune. He was contented to let well enough alone.

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE IN BOSTON. 1852-1860.

In the spring of 1852 Leonard R. Cutter and Mercy Taylor were united in marriage by Rev. Arthur Swasey of Brighton, at the home of Mr. Jacob F. Taylor, a brother of my mother's. This was the foundation of a union which existed over forty years, productive of great happiness to themselves and all who came in contact with their home. Their natures seemed adapted to each other. Father was bold, fearless, always ready to take the lead. Mother was quiet, rather timid and retiring, and never desirous of leading. The understanding regarding children was, in father's words, that he would take care of the boys, and mother of the girls. As there were only two daughters, the care and government devolved upon mother, and most faithfully and well did she care for them. Her home and her children were her life. Society had no charms for her, but her relatives and a few intimate friends were always welcome to her home, and living as they did in Boston, both members of large families, there were many visits each year from aunts and cousins.

Before marriage father had been in business for a couple of years and had invested his savings in a little brick house in a court named Grove Place, back of the store. Here they first lived very simply, mother for a few months doing her work, but at the advent of their first child in the fall of 1852 she had help and continued to ever after. They always boarded a clerk while father kept store. They lived in the court for two years, until father was able to build another house on Grove Street, No. 14, where they lived for eight or ten years. Nov. 6, 1852, their daughter Agnes Elizabeth was born. Father proposed naming the baby for mother, Mercy, but she would not consent. Then he proposed Agnes and she Edith, but Agnes was finally decided upon with the middle name Elizabeth for mother's oldest sister. In father's letters at this time are allusions to the little one. In March, 1853, he writes: "Baby grows fast and roguish."

In a letter dated Oct. 9, 1853, he writes to his brother Edward: "I have put off going to visit you until another season. I am building me

two houses; have sold the one that I now live in, and intend to move into one of the new ones in the spring if I have good luck in getting them done." These were the houses 14 and 16 Grove Street.

In the same letter he continues:

"I have just closed a letter to father. I have got a good chance to trade his farm for a place in Cambridge, a small place. I have talked the matter over with Jones, and he and I think it will be a good chance for father to sell off all his stock, hay and grain this fall, it fetches a good price this year, and then to sell his farm. I think I could sell it or rather get net for him some twenty-five and perhaps twenty-eight hundred dollars, and then he would get whatever his hay and stock come to besides. I want him to state some price that he will sell it to me for, as I suppose he and the man could not trade, for father would not be bothered with a place here, therefore I shall have to take the trade on to my own shoulders. I am not afraid, for I never saw a thing or a place but what I could get rid of some way. Father must have the money or second mortgage on real estate for his security.

"I would be glad to alter his position so that he would not have to work so hard. What comfort can we take in going to see them both struggling so hard at work and making nothing at that? If you think it best for him so to do, please to interest yourself at this time; get Daniel's views on it. I wrote to him to call over and talk with you and Daniel about it. The man wants to trade, and he is not a speculating man, but is worth some money, and wants to get a farm somewhere in the country; wants to go up and see it. I showed him that painting and he carried it out for his folks to see, and they all liked it very much."

In a letter dated Oct. 23, 1853, to his brother Edward, he writes: "My purpose in writing is to have you, if it is convenient, fetch some money down with you and take up father's notes, or let me have it and I will give you security; get it at five per cent and I will pay you six. It would save me getting it here if you would, for I have got to deliver twenty-five hundred dollars in goods in six months' time to pay for building my two houses that are now going up. I am confident that I shall make a thousand in the trade. If I had had a thousand by me a week ago last Monday, I should have made two hundred on another trade of real estate."

It was during this year, 1853, that Mr. Shattuck, the husband of his oldest sister, came to Boston as his clerk, and stayed a few years, bringing his family with him.

In a letter dated May 9, 1854, the business of this time is shown very

plainly; he is still busy with the store, and yet a part of his success comes from outside speculation. He writes to his brother:

"I received your letter just now, and in relation to money, I will give you eight per cent for it. As respects your going in with me in speculation, if you were here and you and I could consult one with the other, we might perhaps help each other. But as we are situated, perhaps it would be as well for you to take the eight per cent; that you would be sure of.

"I have got my houses most done; shall get them done this month. I have let one for \$450 a year; the other I intend to occupy, or a part of it; the other half let for \$225. So you can see the result of the speculation. The houses cost me, all told, six thousand dollars, and they will let quick, if I did not occupy one myself, for nine hundred dollars a year. The taxes and insurance will amount to nearly seventy-five dollars. I owe some six hundred to be paid in goods when they are done, and then I have them all free except a thousand-dollar mortgage on each. I can take, if I would, nine thousand dollars for them in cash, if I say the word. That will be seven thousand in cash in hand, and then I will pay the two-thousand mortgage. But I think it to be a safe and good investment and I intend to keep them. If you can get money up there, I would like good mortgages; I can get them the best now. But on them we get only six per cent to run two or three years. I can give a good mortgage to you for security if you want. You had better get your money and come down if you can leave. We are all well. Jones I see often, once or twice a week. He told me he had tried a case and got it in Griffin's absence. Please to answer or come soon. Your affectionate brother,

"L. R. CUTTER."

Under the date of June 3, 1854, he writes:

"I should have answered your letter before, but I have been so busy that I have not had time to post my books. I have some eighteen men at work on my houses, and I look after them close, or they will shirk their duty. As regards money, it has got to be easier than it was. If you can get money for less than six per cent, I can get you good mortgages at any time for six per cent, and if I learn of any safe chance to do better, I will write you.

"I saw Mr. Mead, the man that wants to buy a pasture, and he says he has an agent in Jaffrey, a Mr. Low; V—— says that father is acquainted with him, has sold him vinegar, etc. He buys for the Meads. Mr. Mead wanted to know what father asked for them. I could not tell him. He thinks of going up some time in June, and then he will look at them. Father must fix on a price, ask enough and then trade as he can. Mr.

Mead wanted to know if he would want all cash down. I told him that all he wished would be good security for part, if it was not desirable on the part of purchaser to pay all down. Mead, or Low, rather, has talked of buying a pasture near him, which is in Rindge near Jaffrey; the man that they have talked with asked \$12 per acre, and they think they can get it for \$10. But from what I told him, he runs of a notion that father's is better. I praised it up well. I think if I was not bound head and heels, hand and foot in business, I could take him up there and sell all that mountain land to him at a good price."

Under date Oct. 15, 1854, is written:

"I have been desiring to write you these some days past in reference to a matter of business. Since I returned from the farm I have been into business deep. I have made some trades larger than ever I did before. I have purchased real estate to the amount of twelve thousand dollars since I saw you. The rent of this real estate is fourteen hundred dollars a year; the taxes will be some near a hundred a year, leaving thirteen hundred net gain. The percentage on that you can reckon as well as I. They are let to good tenants, sure of my rent every month. Houses are not to be found here empty; they are scarce enough, I assure you. Advancing the rents all through the city is the order of the day. What I would like to have you do is this, to get me three thousand dollars, and I will give you a mortgage as good as can be had in the city or country on a brick house that I pay four thousand for, and get it then less than it cost the seller by three or four hundred dollars. I will have the insurance run to you, in case of fire, to put the law up all round to your safety. If you can get it within a month or two, I am willing to pay you one per cent for your trouble and your expenses here and back. I would like to have it run five years, or three at least. Samuel Buss is a tenant of mine. Before he knew it I and another man bought where he lives and keeps store and three houses adjoining. He feels somewhat sorry that he didn't buy, I think, by his looks. He is one of those men who had rather have his money in the savings bank and let speculation go. I have made more by speculation than groceries. My rents are amounting to some eighteen hundred dollars a year above taxes. My interest money is (after I get that three thousand) some six hundred a year, which will give me a net gain over all expenses of a thousand a year besides what I can make at my shop. Is not that better than putting into the savings bank? I desire you to say nothing of this financial matter of mine that I have unfolded to you. I am going, or trying, to get

my milkmen, who are trying to buy a pasture together in Jaffrey, to call on father and buy his before they trade with the other man who lives near them in Lexington. Say to father, if you should see him, not to ask them much over what he would take. If I was not pressed with business I would go up with them."

Such were the business cares my father was carrying when a young man not thirty. He did not neglect his grocery business. An interesting story has been told me in regard to the purchase of a shipload of brown Havana sugar, upon which he made fifteen hundred dollars. He went to the sale attired in his work clothes, and when the first lot was put up the older grocers looked at him and thought he would want to buy only a little; but what was their surprise to find that he bought and paid for the whole cargo and then and there resold the most of it to them, making a good round sum. His credit was always good from the start, and never was it shaken through his whole career.

Our home in Boston was always an open house to all the cousins, and my parents were always held in the greatest love and esteem by them all. As early as Aug. 24, 1853, I find in a cousin's letter written from Jaffrey (she resided in Peterboro and had been visiting in Boston) the following written to my mother:

"We are all having a fever among Uncle Leonard's relations, both here and at home, because we heard you were not coming up, and I felt so bad I sat down and had a cry about it. When you answer this, please write that you are coming up to visit us. They say that the reason is because you say Agnes is fretty. You bring her up here and she will be as good as a kitten. If she is fretty—I cannot think she is unless she has altered from what she was when I was there—all the reason is because she wants to see her grandparents and cousin Nett."

From another cousin in a letter to my mother dated April 2, 1854:

"I shall expect to see you here this summer and cousin Agnes. Oh, how I would like to run in and see you all; never did I spend seven weeks so pleasantly and have them pass away so quick as those I spent with you. I thank you a thousand times for your kindness to me."

Under date January, 1855, my father writes to his brother:

"As regards money, I think your folks have got their ears pricked up to a high pitch because of some men here (that their paper is good for nothing, anyway) paying high rate of interest. I can get money here without paying any such interest. In my opinion, we shall get money enough in about three or six months from this date. If I had any, I

should want to salt it down, so that after it grew easier it would not affect mine.

"I will take one thousand at eight per cent to run one year, or at seven per cent to run two, if it is desirable on your part, and give you a mortgage. For I want to put a mortgage on my Botolph Street house of three thousand when I do any, so that I can sell it subject to that amount; not that I am in want of so much money, but to help the sale of it, and then I can operate somewhere else (mind this, as the Irishman said). Whatever money I have of you is to be paid *sure*, for I give you security for it; it is not like taking notes with other names for security. I know that others perhaps pay more for money, but such men look out for them such times as these. Money is getting easier here now, and after some more failures it will be more plenty. It is the notes of such men that the brokers are paying high rates of interest for, and the rates will increase as the notes increase, and by and by down goes the man, so that the last notes that were discounted are, in fact, good for nothing.

"I stand pretty well in relation to these times. I owe not much, and best of all I have not much owing me; as the old woman said, when she spilt her milk, blessed be nothing; so that if the whole city fail, I stand firm and independent (don't wish to boast, however). I will pay you all I think I can afford and live by it. Unless I can get three thousand for three or five years, it would be no object. I would give you now two per cent for three thousand to run three or five years; that is allowing eight per cent for the first year and six per cent for the rest. I am in no great hurry for it; you can see how you can operate. As for drawing money out of your bank there, I do not know what real benefit it will be to me, and perhaps it will trouble me and you both to our inconvenience. I think good mortgages will be in demand in a few months. I do not look at the future as dark at all.

"A happy New Year and success in your business is my wish."

March 8, 1855, he writes:

"How is money in your town? Is there any chance for a good mortgage, first class, to be cashed at six per cent, to run three or five years with a good note? I have got along through the hard times better than I expected. I have not been obliged to borrow money at all. I have my house paid for in Botolph Street (with the exception of a thousand dollars, which is to be paid in goods), and I have some two thousand on hand, so I shall get through with my four-thousand-dollar trade without raising a mortgage as I wished some months ago. Money here has got

to be quite easy, as you can see by the monetary in your paper, and probably in one month or two it will be flush at six per cent, and perhaps at five on good mortgages.

"If I could get some one, two or three thousand within a month, I could make another trade that I could realize twelve per cent profit on; buy another house in the same way that I bought the last.

"My house on Botolph Street I raised the rent a hundred dollars per year and get it with no trouble. I got Jones to get the old tenant out, and I let it within twenty-four hours after to a good, responsible man. If you have any money that you want to invest safely at six per cent, write me and I will pay you something for your trouble. I suppose you hear a good deal said about this time on the state election, as it is near at hand." He signs this letter, "From your brother, an old Fogie Whig."

In a letter dated September, 1855, making an offer of mortgage and request for loan and mentioning the sale of the first house he owned and occupied, he adds:

"I wish you to keep still and I will tell you what I have done. I have bought the house and store where I keep; paid seven thousand dollars. I get a rent, besides my own rent, of five hundred and forty dollars, and they do all their own repairs. So I get my own rent and some more besides clear. I wanted some money to make up the amount over and above the mortgage, which was four thousand and five hundred dollars. Mr. Mann held that. I got it of my wife's brother, who told me if I wanted any money in my business at any time he would let me have it (quite convenient for me). He is worth some hundred thousand dollars, they say, out where he lives. He never wants over six per cent."

During this year numerous letters came from his mother requesting him to help sell the large farm of seventy acres, on which his parents are living alone, both over seventy, or if otherwise, to make some arrangement for them, which was afterwards done, and the place is still in the family. Oxen, cattle, vinegar and apples are all sent to him to dispose of, and a pleasant privilege he seems to consider it. His helpful spirit towards all his family is very noticeable at this time. During this year his sister, Mrs. Fox, from the West came on and visited our home in Boston.

Under date of Dec. 3, 1855, he writes:

"I have bought another house at auction about a month since, and on it is a mortgage that is now due; the man says he will let it be if I will give him a little extra interest; he wishes to have it run three years. I

said to him that I did not pay over six per cent for money, and if he wished I would let his mortgage be, otherwise I should pay it. And now how is it with you, or going to be for a month or two to come? This mortgage is a good one on a house close to my store. There is some prospect of my paying the mortgage in West India goods, which will suit me first rate to do so. A man that I trade with is going to try to trade for it; he thinks he can draw out one-half in goods and the rest in cash. As regards my going up to see you, I would like to, so far as the pleasure of visiting you and Daniel is concerned; but when I think of the cold weather you are so apt to have up there about this time (going over the mountains, for instance) I hardly think it worth while, and being busy, too, I think I had rather adjourn it until summer weather. Jones has decided on an office, I believe. I hope he will make a fortune, but it seems to me that Jordan would be a hard road to travel if I had to wait for business as he will have to for the first year. I intend to help him to all the law business that I can. I have been lawing it some myself lately; got my case, too, which was all the best of it. Great head! that I am not any the loser, but rather a gainer.

In a letter relating to his parents and their farm he writes, Jan. 13, 1856:

"What to do with the farm is beyond my judgment to tell. Frequently they have written to me to know what they shall do or what to do with the farm. I have advised them to sell, but if they can't sell to get the value, then it is of no use to try, for the farm is of no great value, in my opinion, nor any other farm thereabouts, therefore the interest of what they can get is but a trifle. Considering the facts, I have advised them to keep it until they can sell it to their mind and be content on it; to hire the work done if it will pay so to do; if not, then let the work go undone and be content to let it go undone. Let the grass grow and decay in its own roots; it won't harm it a mite. They want some place to live and they must have a home, for old folks want a home more than young folks, and no place in my opinion will suit them better than where they live now. But the great trouble is, they need some one to look after them, and they will not, in fact, let any one do it until their infirmities compel them so to do.

"Selling the farm is not going to rid them of the infirmities of old age, and they have got to have some one take care of them as these infirmities creep on them. I do not look at the sale of the farm as very much loss to them. Father will never stop work until he is obliged to; if he has only

one acre of land he will work all he is able to ; it is his nature. I think it would ease father the most to sell his mountain pasture. He takes cattle to keep, and they keep bothering him all the season coming up after a cow or a pair of oxen or some other trifle, so that he has to go to the pasture three or four times a week and sometimes as many in a day."

A letter dated March 7, 1856, contains the following:

"Mr. Sperry was just in here (he is the man that I have had some twenty thousand dollars dealing with) and wanted to know if I could take two mortgages of seven thousand dollars (\$3,500 each). Said he would give a liberal bonus for the money if he could get it soon. I told him I would inform my moneyed friends of the chance and let him know.

"And now if you know, or can financier so as to take them, just inform me by return mail and the bonus that you will do it for. The mortgages are good, on good brick houses, secured by insurance, etc. I could take them by giving my notes to run into the banks, but I don't care to embarrass myself too much. I have taken already a two-thousand one and have made four notes, and they are in the bank. My rents are three hundred a month ; that with what I make other ways will just meet these notes. If you can't get or do not care to get the seven thousand, can you three thousand and for what bonus? Perhaps you can get it from your bank. These mortgages run three years, I suppose. I do not know, as I did not ask him, but his mortgages are always made so. He says he can sell the two houses for six thousand apiece ; that is, twenty-five hundred for the equity on the thirty-five-hundred mortgage. It would be as safe as the bank. Please to think of it and answer soon."

Business is all-engrossing at this time, as seen by a letter dated April 8, 1856:

"As regards the twelve hundred dollars, I will take it at eight per cent, give a note on demand, secured by a mortgage if desired ; that will enable you to make two per cent. I had rather have three thousand dollars and fix it for three years by paying a bonus of one hundred. You spoke about going west. I do not know how my business will be at that time. I have got a lot cut out, and if I should get through it so that I could spare the time, I would like to go ; can tell better by and by."

Under date May 6, 1856, he writes:

"How is money? I have, or can make, a trade by taking two mortgages of three thousand each, and now I would like to have some one take one of them and give me the money some time between now and the first of August, and eight hundred I want now to accomplish the trade.

On the eight hundred I will give you eight per cent until I pay it; on the three thousand I would give a bonus, the sum of one hundred, if I could not get it for less. Money is quite easy here now, and I think it will be this summer. But I do not find time to look up those that have it, and if it is any benefit to you to get the bonus, I had rather it would go into your hands than a stranger's.

"I never have as yet paid any bonus but to you. Now if you can get the sum of eight hundred and send me within a week or so, and three thousand in three or four months and take the mortgage to run three years (a first-class one), then I shall be all right to put the trade through. I can get the two mortgages through by using twenty-eight hundred of borrowed capital besides my own. And now if you can furnish that amount, I will give you all the security wanted and the bonus as above stated.

"I have been laid up sick with the rheumatism, had a time of it for about ten days, lost eighteen pounds of flesh. I have got out and am about over with it. Being rather weak, I had a good mind to run off and call on you and Daniel, but as my counter wanted me I did not go. I made a clerk of Jones while I was confined to my room."

I remember my mother's description of this illness. It was the only severe illness he ever had. It was an attack of rheumatic fever, and mother said that the jar from a person's walking across the room would cause him great pain.

On November 2, 1856, a letter to his brother gives us some idea of his business transactions:

"I write to you at this time to ascertain how the money market is in Peterboro', and whether or not you can get enough to discharge the thirteen-hundred-dollar mortgage and interest and to take a three-thousand mortgage that I have now in my possession. I can get it at a broker's by paying two hundred bonus. I would willingly pay a hundred, for I want the ready cash. I have got this fall four thousand dollars and had to pay no bonus, and the same man says that he will, in course of a month, let me have more and perhaps take this three-thousand mortgage that I now hold. It is a first-class one, and I thought perhaps you might have the money on hand and wish to swell your riches so as to give me the difference and take a larger one by my giving you a bonus. I tell you what it is, Ned, when you have such notices as I have in my pocket to pay into the bank sixteen hundred and fifty dollars the next day, you have to be wide awake; four days ago I had only two hundred in my



HOMESTEAD, JAFFREY, N. H.

pocket. I have had to scratch, but I have it all and it will be paid forthwith. I shall have paid at the end of the year some ten thousand dollars in notes to the different banks in this city. After this one is paid to-morrow I shall have only a seven-hundred one to pay on the first of next month, and that ends this year's transactions, which will, I anticipate, be quite profitable to me. By the way, I would like to know if you want the interest on your notes paid; if so, I think of going to Jaffrey to respond to an invitation from mother on the 17th to be there on the 18th, and at that time I hope to see you and will pay it if wanted; if not, I will pay interest on the interest when I do pay. I am paying off the mortgage under yours on the houses on Grove Street. I have paid six hundred of it and Hancock wants the rest soon, so there will be no mortgage but yours left. I received a letter from Nehemiah Cutter yesterday, and he said that he attended a Fremont meeting and expected to hear you speak, but was disappointed, and I was glad of it. Don't, for the country's sake, blow for Fremont, for he will be laid out next Tuesday, sure as fate, and won't be heard from for four years."

The Mr. Hancock referred to in this letter was a relative of Governor John Hancock, and, I believe, lived in the old Hancock house on Beacon Street. Father used to go there to make his payments.

A letter written this year gives a little sight of his political views. He writes:

"I perceive the topic in your mind is politics. I am bound to vote for Fillmore or nobody. As regards the Fremont party, I hope the day will never dawn when they will get the reins of government. They are nobody, all over the lot and round the same. I tell you, if the old Whig party don't revive in four years from now and whip everything, this country will go down. But they will do it just as sure as fate, and will be a larger party than ever before, and will put things to rights.

"As for the old Loco-Foco party, I never want to train with them until they are regenerated from whatever I knew them to be. They have stirred up the pool, and now let them settle it or be beat. I surely hope they will get justice done, and it will teach them some things that may do them good.

"I think our candidate, Fillmore, will carry this city and, I hope, the State. There are a great many Fillmore men hereabouts. I hope that he will be elected. I am going to give him all the help I can.

"J—— is blowing for old Buchanan. I think he had better hold in

hereabouts, for they ask me if he is my brother. They say they would not own such a one. But enough of nonsense."

On August 9 of this year his mother is seventy years old, and a few extracts from her letter written July 28 are characteristic:

"I shall be seventy years old the ninth day of August, and we shall be very happy to have you and your family come up and make us a visit at that time; your health will be better if you come into the country. We are all parched up with drought, but hope to have some rain soon. Rachel wants you all to meet her here the day her mother is seventy years old. I have arrived at the age of man. All the rest of my days should be spent in doing good on earth, in obeying the commandments of my Saviour and being a pattern of piety. I feel that my days are few, and I want to spend them to meet the acceptance of my Heavenly Father. It is a sad thing to die, but we must all die. The young may die, but the old must die. I have lived to see my children grown up and agreeably settled in the world, most of them. A very large family has been spared to me at a very advanced age, but one has gone; she was a dear one. I can see now where I failed in bringing you all up. I could do better again, but I do not want any of you to follow my bad example, but try to do better, far better. Do all you can to get religion, follow the paths of virtue, seek for it as for a hidden treasure, honor God and keep His commandments; this is the whole duty of man."

On Nov. 18, 1856, his parents celebrated their golden wedding by a family party. In the following letter, dated October, 1856, came the invitation from his mother.

"I now write to you to give you an invitation to come up with your wife and child to visit us the eighteenth of November next, as it will be fifty years that day since we were married. We want all our children and grandchildren to meet together at our house on that day. As it will be near Thanksgiving, we shall have that for our Thanksgiving, and we lot upon seeing our dear children once more together.

"We received a number of papers from you; we thank you very kindly for them. I have read them through two times to your father, who was well pleased to hear them. He says he shall give his vote for Mr. Fillmore. The Democrats brag and say they have got him on their side; I hope they have not; he has always been a strong Whig until now. I am very sorry he has altered his mind. If I were a man I would vote for Col. Fremont and not be a Democrat; he is the right man, I think. I am sorry you are not on that side. You used to be a strong Whig. My

father was as strong a Whig as ever was, and I follow his good example. I hope the best man will be elected."

During the year 1857 my father took his first journey of any length and went west as far as Illinois. It was a matter of state business, and he was sent by Gov. Gardner. Extracts from letters at that time will best give his impression. On Feb. 20, 1857, he writes from Cleveland, Ohio:

"You may be somewhat surprised to receive a letter from me here in Ohio, but I had a good chance to slip off and see the country, have my expenses paid and wages, so I thought I would go. I am, if nothing prevents, going to Rockton to-morrow if the cars go far enough. It is fine travelling in the cars now, for there is no dust, but the western country is the muddiest country I ever saw. I would not care to live here. I left Boston Monday and travelled to Troy and stayed at the Union House there; next day went to Buffalo and next to the great Niagara Falls; took a carriage and rode all round it both sides, across the Suspension Bridge; next day arrived here, and have to go to Columbus before I return. Shall return, I hope, in two weeks or so. I pick up some friends every day."

In a letter written to his little daughter, then under five years of age, on this trip, he writes:

"This is an awful muddy country; I never saw the like before. I am very well, and intend starting for Columbus in about three hours. I had a good time seeing Niagara Falls; they are splendid. I found a friend, a student from Oberlin College, who had been to the Falls before, and wanted to see them again, so he and I took the cars together from Buffalo, about nine, went to the Falls, hired a coach and rode around over the wire bridge and saw all the sights and were very much pleased with them. I am intending to see the governor to-morrow and present my papers. Should I not be able to find him, I think I shall go to Rockton, Ill., where Aunts Susan and Abby live. You must be a good girl; I shall be at home soon. When you can write, I shall expect an answer to this."

In another letter, written from Columbus, Ohio, on this trip, he writes to his daughter:

"How are you getting along without your father, and have you been a good girl? I shall have to ask your mother when I return. I expect to be at home the last of next week, if I have good luck. I am beginning to want to get home. I have ridden in the cars as long as I wish. I have had enough of it. I was glad to hear from you and your mother. I never wanted a letter more."

The visit to his sisters in Rockton at that time was entirely unexpected to them and he surprised both of them. He went to their door and asked for a lodging for a stranger. His older sister told him she had a lodging for *him*, as she recognized him very quickly. The younger sister demurred quite a little, and had it not been for his laugh, which betrayed him, she would have turned him away to the hotel in the town. In a letter to his brother dated March 27, 1857, he writes:

"I think when I wrote you last I was in Ohio. I am now in Boston, where I desire to stay instead of living in such a country as the West. The State of Massachusetts paid my expenses, so I got pay for my time and travelling expenses. When I see you I will tell you all about my agency, and what I think of the country, which is not very favorable. I assure you I had rather draw a handcart in Boston for the sake of living there than live in the West and do nothing. They say I was there in the wrong season of the year, but that is just the time to judge, for I find in buying butter that if the outside is good there is no danger of the middle. But to business! When I saw you last we had some talk in relation to your small mortgage on the house in which I live, about your wanting it paid some time this spring. Do you and are you going to want it? I have sold my May Street property to S. L. B., one of the tenants, and I am to have, on the first of April next, one thousand dollars and in four months one thousand more, which will be paid on the first of August, and seventeen hundred and fifty in two years from the first of April next, secured by a first-class mortgage, less the fifty per cent on the value of the security. It is a good brick house on May Street.

"Now if you are willing and don't want your money before, I would like to have you discharge the mortgage of thirteen hundred and take that one that I am to have, or get some one of your moneyed neighbors to take the seventeen-hundred-and-fifty-dollar one. You will please to write me by return mail, whether or not you want the money and how you feel inclined to do respecting it. I shall make in buying that property a clear thousand over and above six per cent on the money. You will recollect that I said something about your buying with me, instead of Puffer, my partner in it. We have sold it for nine thousand five hundred dollars. We paid eight thousand. I thought I would let it go at that price. My partner thought we had better let it go at Mr. Buss's first offer, which was nine thousand, but he came up to my offer. I shall have my property well situated now. I intend to have no mortgages on the two houses where I live, and there is none on the house where Mr. Shattuck lives and

one other house that I own. I have a clear income over and above all expenses now of twenty-five hundred a year from my real estate. I don't believe I could do any better out west."

Under date of May 24, 1857, father writes:

"I have been very well this spring, free from rheumatism ever since I had it last spring. Business here is hard, everything in the eatable line is very high and therefore profits are small, and every now and then a merchant fails. People look each other in the face and know not who is good and who will fail next. I myself am little concerned, as I have little due me. Since I sold that last estate to B——, I have spent my time mostly in attending auction sales, as there are a great many goods thrown into the market of various kinds from the effect of people being short for money and also failures. I had paid to me two thousand dollars, and that money I have used in that way, and in sugar some thousand more, which will pay me a good profit. I do not do any order business now, as there is so little made on groceries and the man that I have traded with has failed. I owed him five dollars, so that I lost nothing by his failure. You spoke of molasses sugar being high. I do not know what your traders charge you, but they will charge you more before you get it for less. I am selling crushed sugar for sixteen cents a pound and no profit at that. It has taken another rise of late. Maple, I should think, would be the cheapest up there. I bought some for ten cents a pound, pure maple.

"I laid in last fall nearly a thousand bushels of potatoes at seventy-five cents a bushel; can get now one dollar and fifty cents for them, so you see you can speculate on some things, although they are high. Flour is going up again to ten dollars a barrel; the best sells for nine and one-half now. For a man with a large family, if he doesn't look out, it will make his hat rim lop, as Daniel used to say.

"As regards your note, I have no right to ask indulgence, as the time has passed when it became due.

"I have a mortgage of three thousand dollars on a house, and have received two thousand towards it from another man, who is going to take it, that is, have it assigned to him, when he lets me have the other thousand. He is an old man. I got three thousand from him last year and gave him a mortgage for that amount; he asks me, however, only six per cent. He told me about the time that I wrote you last that he probably should let me have the other thousand some time this spring, and I have calculated to take that, put enough with it, and pay your note. I am

expecting to see him with the money every day. If I had not calculated on that money, I should have paid you out of the money that B—— paid me.

"But as money can be invested by me to pay rather more than six per cent, it is an object for me to have it, if I do not have to pay more than six per cent for it, and for choice I should rather keep the money than pay you, but I have no such right, unless you can put the man off that you owe, or have a chance to get hold of some there without trouble at six per cent. Then again, I had rather pay a small mortgage than to have it cover as much property as your small (\$1,300) one does. So that I think I shall be able to meet it.

"If that old man does not get it this spring or before June 17, then I shall have to borrow until I get of him. He has my note for the two thousand dollars, without any security, on demand.

"If you can put your man off, or tell him how the money is coming, so that he will take it at the time the old man lets me have it, that would just suit me. I never go to the old man to hurry him any; I should rather borrow; but just as soon as he gets it he comes right to me with it. He is like mother, does not like to keep money so as to lose interest, but desires me not to take it unless it will pay me six per cent. He is a very good old gentleman and is rich, worth some fifty thousand dollars, or more, for aught I know. He has lost a good deal by stocks.

"I intend to board my family at Mr. Mann's this summer in Framingham. I can go up Sunday mornings and return Mondays, so that it will be of little inconvenience to me and give them a good chance to be in the country. Agnes goes to school near, is delighted in going, dreams every night about it. She would want to send a kiss to your boy, did she know that I was writing."

Oct. 4, 1857, is written:

"Some time has elapsed since I received a line from you. I was in Jaffrey about the 20th of last month, and should have gone to Peterboro' had I had more time. If I had gone to Peterboro' I should have broken up my time so that I should have had no visit anywhere, and I wanted to indulge in a little sport, such as gunning, for that is my favorite sport. So I travelled through the woods most of the daytime when fair.

"I find that father and mother are getting old. Every year tells on their wrinkled brows, and I fear that a few short years will return them to their final resting-place. I think that we ought to call and see them as often as we can, as it pleases them and inconveniences us but little.

"I suppose you take a Boston paper and have probably noted the monetary crisis that is now tumbling so many of our merchants to ruin.

"Never before in my short experience did I see the like. It is, if not now, going to equal the famous panic of 1837, in the opinion of many.

"It is impossible to know the true value of any property, particularly of merchandise. One man will ask one price, and another, driven to extremity, will sell for a great deal less, cash down. For my single self, I am glad of it, I rejoice to see their fall; it will sift the chaff from the wheat, and then we will see those who do their business straightforward and upright and those that do not and are nothing but walking shadows in the community.

"No one, in my opinion, has a right to carry on speculation without capital and to lean on the banks, for in times like these they will see where they are.

"I had a thousand dollars paid in to me last week, and I went and drew out the gold, for I think the banks will have to suspend specie payment before long or fail. So I took the safe way and got the specie, and I have no particular call to use it but to buy merchandise when I can get it cheap.

"I am offered five per cent a month for it, but I would not let it, if they would give me ten and security. I have no doubt but what I could get ten, but how to get it again when due I know not; therefore I will keep it in my safe, for I do not know what is yet to come. We have not seen the bottom as yet by a long chalk, in my opinion.

"One thing will be for our benefit, and that is we shall get our necessary articles of food cheaper. We have paid too much for such articles of late years, and it is that very thing in my opinion that has caused this crisis; and now let it come and let every speculator that has been backed up by our banks to go out west and buy up all of the grain of that country and make us pay high prices, let him fall and the banks that have backed him with him, and also the sugar speculators.

"I attended the meeting our merchants held here, and it was a great one, but what could they do? One recommended one thing, another another, and so on, but they can do just nothing but look at each other.

"Yesterday, I think, was the bluest day that State Street ever saw. Quarter bills and notes all came due yesterday, being the end of grace.

"The first of the month coming as it did, and to-day being Sunday and the end of grace, all had to be paid yesterday, two days' business in one. I have not been so well situated for such a crisis since I have been in

business. I have been this year closing up my field of business that I had previously laid out.

"I wonder how the western fever is now, and how they are standing up under the pressure. I do not envy them their positions. I think it will hoist the West as high as a kite—my word for it and watch. Flour is falling very fast and all kinds of grain, and that is just what will kill them. Railroad stock is worth comparatively nothing; any quantity of orders to sell and none to buy. Bank stock is falling fast; the Merchants' Bank stock I can buy for ninety dollars, and falling every day at that; it is, I believe, considered the best bank in Boston.

"It is impossible for a man to know what he is worth. These times will give us an insight to the operations of the West; they are always offering such large interest on money. I wonder what they offer there just now. I guess they can't get it at any offer. The whole business is prostrated, and when it will revive again no one can tell."

On Nov. 10, 1857, a second daughter was born. She was named Emma Adelaide. Mother asked father if he felt disappointed because it was another girl. He said no, he had just as soon have girls as boys, except if one had property to leave, it seemed a little safer to leave it to boys, who might be able to immediately control and care for it.

His brother Edward had a little son born just two weeks before his daughter Emma was, and he proposed and did name him Henry Arthur. In a letter dated March 29, 1858, he writes:

"Don't call your boy Henry Arthur, for that is the name of the ugliest darky that Southac Street ever produced. Perhaps being a Free-Soil man, you may relish it better. As for politics, I accomplished my purpose last fall, as you recollect when here. I am no Free Soiler and never mean to be."

During this year his brother-in-law, who had been his clerk for a number of years, left him and went into business for himself in Pepperell. He was obliged to hire a green one, directly from the country.

During the summer of 1858 he took his oldest daughter to Jaffrey for a short rest, leaving wife and little baby at home. "Little Aggy" had gone as far as Pepperell with a cousin, and from there her father took her. I have heard my cousins tell about the trunkful of pretty dresses that mother sent with me and how they planned to have me wear them all. In a letter written to mother during the visit I find:

"I received your letter last night; was glad to hear from you and to hear that the baby was getting along without growing worse. I intended



HOMESTEAD, JAFFREY, N. H.

to have had this letter written and sent yesterday, but being a late riser and the mail going out so early in the morning, that I did not get under way to send it. I suppose it will be all the sweeter when you do get it. I found Aggy at Pepperell, when I arrived there, well. We came to Jaffrey on the following Wednesday. We had a load of young people in the stage coming over from Winchendon. We were so numerous that the stage coach had to come up in town to bring us home to father's door.

"We found them all well at home as usual. Aggy is in her element; she is out with the children all the time. She goes to school every day; they draw her in their little wagon. It makes me feel happy to see her so happy. She complained with the toothache this morning, but I picked out some two or three blackberry seeds and put in some cotton and camphor and I heard no more complaints. She sat in the singing-seats this afternoon with Mary Abbie. She says she would like to see you and the baby, but says she is going to stay here. When I come to go, I think she will want to. I think that I shall go home on Friday or Saturday. I am going to Peterboro' Sunday this week. I have not been on the mountain as yet.

"They have found some fault with me because I did not bring you and the baby with me.

"The East Village Church talk of having a picnic next Wednesday on the mountain. I think I shall join them. I have spent my time mostly in hunting thus far; have burnt up my fireworks and about half of my powder. I have been teasing Aggy to write a line, but she says she had rather that I would. She wants me to write that she is having a nice time; she has concluded to come home with me.

"Tell Richard to look out for bad bills.

"I think it will not be worth while to get out at West Acton on my way home. I begin to want to see both you and little Emma."

About this time my father took his first public office, that of an assessor. He always showed an interest in politics and in the affairs of country, state and city, but business was always first in his mind.

In a letter dated July 26, 1859, he writes:

"My family go to Framingham this day, and about the third or fourth of next month to Jaffrey.

"I am having a very pleasant time now, spending from half past eight to half past twelve every day in the City Council chamber attending to the duties of an assessor, in company with some forty others. We hold one session a day, for which we receive three dollars. I shall probably get

through with the duties of an assessor so that I can leave the city by the first of August."

While performing the duties of an assessor he went from house to house in different sections of the city and was brought in contact with a great many people, all of which he enjoyed, and was very fond of relating his experience in this office.

About this time he purchased on Leverett Street what was called the "old jail" property and commenced building houses consisting of suites or flats. These were among the first of that kind of houses built in Boston.

Under date of July 30, 1859, is written:

"I had a fine time yesterday; spent the day with the city officers; had a train of cars at our bidding; we went to the Cochituate Lake and had a splendid dinner, etc.

"I am going to building my houses on Leverett Street next week. I have taken out my permit to-day and have let out my job by contract. I shall get my lines next week from the city engineer. I shall not be able to stay at Jaffrey all the time that my family do, but shall be back and forth as time will admit."

Oct. 25 he writes to his brother:

"I received a line from you yesterday and hasten to reply. I would like that three thousand dollars very much, and could use more if I had it to make the payments on my new building. I think of commencing another one side of it soon. I have not got the roof on as yet.

"We would like to see you here very much, or you can send it if you like. I wish I could get some ten thousand dollars or so for good mortgages, and I would like to build two houses more."

Under date Nov. 18, 1859, I find:

"I received your line and beg leave to reply. I will not put you to the trouble of borrowing the money for me at the bank because I can get along without it just now. I am quite short, but they must wait.

"I have concluded to go to Jaffrey Thanksgiving, Aggie and I. M—— thinks she will not go on account of leaving our youngest.

"J—— thinks he will go if nothing prevents. We have received no invitation from Jaffrey. I suppose it will not be necessary to wait for one, will it?

"I received a letter from Sister R—— on business relating to my selling her turkeys, which she is going to send me on Monday, but in that letter nothing was intimated about our going up. I have answered it to-day

and have stated to her what we have thought of, if it should be agreeable to her and them. I have no doubts in my mind in relation to its being agreeable to her and them all. Therefore I shall expect to see you there, and I hope Daniel will be over."

In closing this chapter I will copy two letters received at this time from his aged mother, the first dated from Pepperell, Mass., Sept. 29, 1858. She was then seventy-two years old and was visiting her oldest daughter. About this time my grandfather had a shock which deprived him of his speech for the rest of his life.

"My dear Son: It is with much pleasure I take my pen to let you know I am better than when you left me. I had a very sick time soon after you left me; since then I have been gaining slowly. R—— came with me to Pepperell. Father is about the same; he thought he could not come here now. He has sold all his vinegar in Peterboro'; he got five dollars a barrel, cash down; he thought he could not carry it to Winchendon. We thank you very kindly for your visit and hope you will come often; we shall never go to Boston again. Much love to M—— and A——; tell them they will never see me again if they do not come up to Jaffrey. Your father cannot talk any better; he has lost all pleasure in life. I hope you will write to us often; we love to hear from our children. E—— came to see us with his family; we see D—— often. We shall soon be gone and you will have no parents to visit. We want you to make us happy as you can by writing to us and visiting us. R—— sends much love to you all. We are having a very good visit here with S. M. She is very glad to have us here. We shall soon go home. I have not much news to write. H. C. is come to visit his home again; he is out of health. We are to have an ordination soon, to ordain Mr. Batchelder; we hope he will do well. The ordination is not appointed yet, but will be soon. E—— is on the committee to appoint it. J. C. is going to leave his father and move away; he has three small children; he is a pedler. I do not think he is worth much property.

"Your Uncle J. is very much pleased with his visit in the city; he talks a great deal about it. We heard that P.'s brother is married; we think C. will soon be. I wish them all well. We had a letter from S. last week; they were all well; sent much love to all her brothers and sisters. She wants you to write to her soon. She keeps canary birds to sell; her children go to school; she has a girl to do her work. I am very glad she can send her children to school. I hope they will be something in the world. A—— is well and raising birds to carry to the fair. I hope she

will get the premium. She wants to get money enough to visit her parents, brothers and sisters another year. I hope she will come and see us. Certain I shall never see her again if she does not come soon. L—— says she will come if she can. I must close this, for you will be tired of reading my poor letter. Please write to me soon and accept of a large share of my love. From your mother, “SALLY CUTTER.”

The last letter I find that she wrote to father is dated March 2, 1859:

“My dear Son: It is with much pleasure that I take my pen to write to a dear child away from me, whom we cannot see but once a year. I wish I could go in and see you as I can D——, but you can ride up and see us if you please. We are always happy to see you and your family. Give a great deal of love to your wife and A——; tell them to come up when blackberries are ripe and see us. R—— will make you a visit, I presume. She will be very happy to see you. Her task is hard; she has to work day and night to keep her family along going to school. I am afraid she will hurt herself. I hope she will have a resting-spell at your house. Father cannot work much. I work all the time except when I read your paper. I thank you very kindly for sending me papers to read. I wish I had something to send you to pay you. A—— sends me a paper every week. My children are very good to me; they know how I love to read, it amuses me. I read to the children and to your father. He loves to hear me as well as any one. I wish he had such a desire to read; it keeps the mind open and bright and strengthens the memory. I hope you will write to me by Rachel how you prosper and get along. We are always happy to hear of your prosperity and happiness. Give my respects to your Uncle A——. Tell him Dr. F. C. has got a son, the only grandson Joel has; he is a month old. His name is Henry Albert, and they are much pleased with the present. You please write to me how J—— makes out. I hope well, but I do not know. We wish him well and you too.

“We thank you very kindly for the invitation you sent to us to visit you with R——, but we never shall ride in the cars again. I hope you and your family will come up here and spend the month of August with us, ride on the mountain, pick berries, visit Peterboro’ and Mason. Your Uncle J—— is dead. He was very sorry you did not visit him when you came up in August. I was sorry I did not hire a horse to go; if I had known how much he thought of seeing you I would. I went to his funeral. R—— rode with me and your Uncle J——. He said you treated him like a gentleman; he said you must come and see him.

"R—— will tell you all the news; she knows as well and better than I do. You must not wait for me to write, for my hands fail me. They are all worn out with hard work. Please to excuse my poor letter, for my hands tremble some. Tell M—— to write to me and not wait for me. I am old and cannot write fit to be seen hardly; if my own children can read it I am glad. We have had a large share of sleighing this winter, but I have not ridden much. If you and Jones were here I should have ridden more. It does me good to ride. I rode to Pepperell last fall and was much better after I came home. I wanted to go to see you, but I could not. I must close this by wishing you well. Please accept this in much love from your mother,

"SALLY CUTTER."

CHAPTER V.

1860-1870.

The opening of this decade finds my father in the midst of business care and starting into political life, for which he always had a certain taste, but it never superseded his business taste. The war was fast approaching, and party spirit was running high. Father always opposed the war; he felt other means of settlement ought to be employed. He lived and kept store surrounded by many colored people, and knew their characteristics well. His houses on Leverett Street, built on the old jail land, were about completed, and he had moved his grocery business into one of the stores there. He was in debt quite an amount at this time, but his judgment and foresight carried him through these financial crises brought about by the war, safe and sound, although at times rather pressed for money. He paid for his buildings through orders on his groceries. My mother was careful and frugal in the household expenses, and every dollar was made to go as far as possible. Some letters written at this time are interesting. Under date of Jan. 12, 1860, he writes to his brother:

"I have commenced trading again; commenced last Monday; have had a great rush ever since. My purpose in writing to you at this time is to get some money, if convenient. I have a note to pay that comes due on the fifteenth of this month, with three days' grace, therefore it must be paid by Wednesday next. The amount of my note is five hundred dollars; it is in the bank. I am confined so close that I have no time to collect what is due me or to run and borrow any.

"If you would send down what is due on that note, I will pay the express for bringing it, be it more or less, if I can get it by Wednesday morning next. I have been purchasing about six thousand dollars' worth of goods, for which I get no money, so you can see my fix that I am in.

"I shall have to borrow some six thousand dollars and mortgage my store and house on Leverett Street. Can't you find it up there somewhere? If you can, I will give you one-half per cent, that is, thirty-eight dollars, for getting it. The title is unquestionable, coming from the city of Boston.

"I shall want some thirty thousand dollars before I get through build-

ing. It is a grand chance for some capitalist or savings bank to invest. I have no time to run round to get it, so I am willing to pay a bonus to you. I want the ready money to operate with in getting my goods in cheap. I can give a mortgage now on this one that I have got built, and on the others when they are up, which will be in the course of three or four months at least. I want to get six thousand dollars by the first of next month, if possible, to pay for my goods that I have bought for cash. I get my thirty days. I received a letter from D——. He wishes me to get a safe for their bank. I am going to answer his letter and see if I can get some of their money, but D—— is not quite so financial a person to operate with as some men are. I suppose he would not like to risk himself with six thousand dollars to come to this city with."

On Jan. 22, 1860, he writes:

"I received your wife's letter last eve. and the one hundred dollars, for which I am greatly obliged. In regard to the balance, do not give yourself any trouble to get it for me, as you are not well. I desire to have it not trouble you, for I can get along without it. I have collected some since I wrote you, and have paid my note, so do not think about it until you are well.

"I was very sorry to learn that you were afflicted again with that same old complaint, the sore throat. I had it, and to my satisfaction, and hope that I may never be afflicted again. Sickness is the greatest calamity that could befall me. I can go into business and work like a tiger and feel all right, but if I am sick I am most miserable. I have been a little afraid of getting sick the last fortnight; got cold, my new store being very damp, and felt almost sick, but am getting my sea legs on again (as the sailors say) and begin to feel better.

"M—— wishes me to say to your wife that she intends to get her things this week, and would have got them last week, but the children were nearly sick with colds and wanted her attention.

"We have put the goods over the road since we opened; have sold nearly five thousand dollars' worth. Had a letter from D—— the other day; all were well.

"Employ the best doctor you can find in Manchester, and get well as soon as you can.

"My motto is to employ the best doctor and get my property insured in the best company.

"Write, or have your wife, and let me know how you are getting along."

A letter dated March 16, 1860, contains the following account of the purchase of his summer residence in Jaffrey:

"I have just arrived from Jaffrey. I attended the sale of Mr. Melville's house, and bid it off at three thousand three hundred and fifty dollars, and now I wish to ask you if it would be safe for me to take it without looking over the records at Keene. As I have bought his interest at the time of making the attachment, I wish to know what it was at that time. I thought you could tell me, as you looked them over in relation to that. S—— says that it is free, except the Widow Davis. D—— said that Melville deeded it to a Mr. Wright for him to deed it to his (Melville's) wife, but there was no consideration to the deed. S—— says if it be desired he will get that discharged, but that it amounts to nothing. The assignment that he made, that you broke up, is that any incumbrance, and how does it stand?

"D—— says that they have paid six dollars to have the records examined, and that it is free, so that the title (the sheriff's deed) will be all right; is that so? Please to answer by return mail.

"I have collected the interest on your two notes of twenty-two each, and have not been able to see Mr. S—— as yet; he lives in Brighton. I will go out there and see him.

"I saw your family at Peterboro'; they were well; all pretty well all round. Father is not quite so well as he was last fall. D—— went over with me. I stopped at father's about an hour or so to dinner. The sale appeared more like a funeral than like an auction. I felt sad myself to see Mr. Melville's home go so under the hammer; but such is fate."

(A few words about the circumstances of this sale to which father alluded in his letter. Mr. Jonas Melville was an old resident of Jaffrey, having come to town in 1822. He built the stone house. When built, it was one of the finest residences between Boston and Keene. As a boy my father used to pass it, driving cattle to Bedford, and he used to think if he could ever have money enough to own such a place as this, he would be perfectly contented.)

Mr. Melville hoped to end his days there, but an unfortunate signing of a friend's note forced him to give up everything he owned in Jaffrey, and the place was sold by the sheriff at auction for the low price named in father's letter. For ten years after purchasing, it was rented to the Rev. Mr. Allen, minister of the Congregational church in East Jaffrey; but in 1870 the railroad came through Jaffrey, and it was furnished for a sum-



NO. 11 DISTRICT SCHOOL HOUSE, JAFFREY, N. H.

mer residence, and occupied by us as long as father and mother lived, and many, many delightful times have been enjoyed there.

On Sept. 9, 1860, my father writes:

"I should have answered your letter ere this, had I not had a great deal on my mind to prevent,—politics and business.

"Mr. T—— has failed; the man that bought me out in my old store. Stopped last Monday, and I shall have the store on my hands again. He did not owe me anything, so I am in luck. I shall get a bonus again for the store; have had one hundred offered me already. I shall not go into it again, but shall let the one have it that will pay me the most.

"As regards politics, I am going to Worcester on Wednesday next as a delegate for the Bell and Everett party, to nominate state officers. We are calculating to upset the "Long Heel" party in the State by uniting with all others to do it. Our convention and the Democrats (both branches) hold the same day, and we are going to talk on the issues and unite if possible.

"John A. Andrew, the Republican candidate for governor, is one of the John Brown stamp. He resides in our ward, and has always acted straight out Garrisonian and Parkerite, and now it remains to be seen how far the Republicans will carry their point.

"It will be a capital joke to them to lose this State. I think if we can unite on good terms with the Democrats (for they are ripe for it) we shall whip the Republicans high and dry.

"In addition to being a delegate, I am on the committee, ward and city, to get up a club in our ward. We have a good many rich old Whigs in our ward, and two who will respond to our wants for funds. We are going to swing to the breeze three or four large Bell and Everett flags, and hire a hall for headquarters. We intend to carry our ward for Bell and Everett (the home of Andrew). I tell you it is of no use to stand it any longer. We are going to give them a clear sweep this time.

"Mr. Banks's resigning has taken the starch right out of them. Thousands that voted for him will not vote for Andrew.

"What are you about up there in the Granite State? Why don't you go in for Bell and Everett? The best ticket out, and the best men are in the party. If you take a Boston daily paper, look at one dated Aug. 31, and you will see a report of our meeting in Ward 6."

As will be seen, father was an old Whig in politics, as his father was before him. After the war, when the Whig party disappeared, he voted in Presidential elections with the Democrats, but was anticipating the

formation of a new party, neither Republican nor Democratic, which should be composed of the best men of each. As a matter of interest I have collected the names of those whom father wished for President at every election in which he always took part, for he considered it most unpatriotic not to vote, and I believe he never failed to do so. He voted as follows: 1848, Taylor and Fillmore; 1852, Scott and Graham; 1856, Buchanan and Breckinridge; in 1860, Bell and Everett; 1864, McClellan and Pendleton; 1868, Seymour and Blair; 1872, Greeley and Brown; 1876, Tilden and Hendricks; 1880, Hancock and English; 1884, Cleveland and Hendricks; 1888, Cleveland and Thurman; 1892, Cleveland and Stevenson.

On Nov. 22, 1860, he writes:

"How is money with you? The Republican party have raised the mischief with the country. A panic is at hand, in spite of thunder. If you want another mortgage of twenty-five hundred dollars by giving me twenty-four, I can accommodate you; write by return mail and let me know.

"I received a line from sister S—— the other day. She wants me to take her Charley; he wants to come to Boston. How is it, are you going to Jaffrey to spend Thanksgiving? If so, write; perhaps Jones, my wife and I will meet you there. He thinks some of going.

"Tell Ramsdell and Smith when you see them to remember what I said to them when at Nashua about Burlingame's election. They would not consent to listen to the truth then; but it was even so."

April 29, 1861, he writes:

"The times are looking bad. I am leasing houses, when I can, to responsible parties, at a less rent, so as to get the start of the landlords around me. I am going to commence building soon.

"I—— B—— called on me the other day and wanted to buy my Melville house in Jaffrey. I told him that he could have it for five thousand dollars and nothing less.

"Volunteers are constantly arriving here; one thousand are coming from Maine to-morrow. I keep out of all military companies. I am no military man. I take four newspapers a day, and read a great part of my time."

In October, 1861, he writes:

"I am going along with my block of new buildings, and am in hopes to get them done by the first of December; that is the time set by contract. I should like to get some twenty-five hundred or three thousand dollars

to complete them. If I should get that amount on a year or two, I should not have to mortgage them. I can mortgage, if I wish, at the old life-insurance office, but if I do I have got to take the money on five years, and take ten thousand dollars, because they do not like nor will they let less than ten thousand in one place.

"If you have any money or the sum named, I would like it, and would give, in addition to my note, a mortgage on the same house that you had one on before, on Lucas Street, of twenty-five hundred dollars. The house has been occupied by the same tenant ever since it was built, some nine years; they pay their rent promptly. The same insurance is on it, and there is no incumbrance. I hope you have not got frightened as to letting money, for there are men just as prompt now as ever, I believe. I am one of that number. I pay all my demands as prompt as ever I did, and am better able every year so far. I intend to stop and not buy any more, nor build until I have cleaned up as I did two years ago and paid off all my mortgages.

"I wish you would write by return mail whether you desire to favor my wish or not. I am in no distress for the money. I should not use it if I had it until next month, when I desire to pay all up that I owe for goods.

"I have no mortgages on my houses on Grove Street, where I live, and other houses I have that have no mortgages on them; but as you know of this on Lucas Street, I have had a mortgage on it before of twenty-five hundred dollars; I mentioned it. I do not wish to pay over six per cent, because I can get it out of the bank here; but I want it more than four months, as I should have to pay it to the bank in that time."

It is hard to realize from father's letters at this time that affairs were as uncertain as they were. His brother wrote to him with underlines: "Look out for hard times, everybody says." Still he pushed right on with his building. Building materials all went up in price; most building was stopped, and men were anxious for work. Father paid the most of the men in groceries, or orders, as they were called. Father's feelings in regard to the war were very strong, and he did not hesitate to give them utterance. While his sympathies were not with the South, nor did he ever think there was any justice in slavery, he felt that there might be other methods of settlement, and he most strongly opposed the war.

At the time there was great feeling against what were termed "Copperheads"; in the excitement of the times the most radical things were done, and my timid mother feared greatly lest father's plain, curt-spoken

words should bring him into trouble, but there was no bridling father's tongue. He was always very fond of games, particularly checkers and backgammon, and just about this time a friend of his was very much interested in billiards. He invited father to play with him, which father did, and became so interested that the first thing he knew streaks of daylight were appearing. He started for home immediately, and I never knew of his playing billiards again to any extent. In the meantime my dear mother was watching and waiting at home. Such a thing had never happened before, and she imagined father either tarred and feathered or suspended by his heels as a much-detested Copperhead. She waited until daylight and started to look him up. She met father on Cambridge Street. "Where have you been?" she asked. "I have been sitting up with a crazy man," he answered, and I think he felt that both he and his companion had been as nearly crazy as sane men could be. He stopped then and there on billiards. When the draft came, I think father, with others who were like-minded, paid money for a substitute, although he was not drafted. All through the war he took the *New York Herald* and carefully preserved them all.

In the summer of 1863 father and mother went west on an excursion trip. They went by way of the lakes. Father enjoyed it very much, but mother was very seasick, and as it was the time of a teachers' convention, everything was crowded. They left the two little girls in Framingham with mother's sister. They visited in Rockton, where father had two sisters settled.

On July 7, 1864, his mother passed away, at the advanced age of seventy-seven years and ten months. She had been failing for some years, and it was a source of great sorrow to father to see his parents losing their strength and vigor. She was a good mother to her children, and it was with sadness they laid her body in its last resting-place.

Until the time of the war father was a constant attendant at church. The family attended the Congregational church on Bowdoin Street, but one Sunday the minister, Mr. Johnson, became so imbued with the spirit of the war that he preached a sermon urging all his congregation to shoulder gun and knapsack; this was very distasteful to father, and he said that if the pulpit was to be made a recruiting office, he would not go to church. From that time he acquired the habit of staying at home, and never after was he constant in church attendance, although he was always a rigorous Sabbath-keeper, never favoring or allowing his family to visit, ride or go about on the Sabbath.

In 1864 father gave up his grocery business and turned his attention brown freestone with large airy rooms, the lower ones nicely frescoed, the chambers being papered. It had a nice bathroom, a furnace, bells and speaking-tubes, and seemed to us children a regular paradise in comparison with the smaller home with no modern improvements that we left on Grove Street. I have often heard father describe the feelings of sadness with which he turned the key for the last time in the old house after all the things were moved. The neighborhood was changing so fast that he did not consider it a good place for his children to live. Father always liked a nice house to live in. He used to say that every man had his fancy or weakness, some for horses, some for dogs, some for travelling, but he thought his was for a nice house. We lived in the house on Hancock Street for eighteen years. Our neighbor directly opposite was Charles Sumner, and the street was filled with the nicest of Boston families.

In 1864 father gave up his grocery business and turned his attention wholly to the care of his real estate. His tenants were increasing in number, and the houses needed his constant supervision and care, so he opened an office in his building, No. 67 Leverett Street, and continued it until he died. A very plain, unpretentious office with a desk and a few chairs, but an office in which a great deal of business was done and much money changed hands.

During those years we had frequent visits from our relatives. One occasion is particularly impressed upon my mind. The place was the large front parlor on Hancock Street; the time was the Fourth of July, very warm, consequently the windows were all open. The dramatis personæ were my father's oldest brother, a physician from Peterboro', who was a northern Democrat, a Douglas and Johnson man; his second brother, a lawyer from New Hampshire, a Lincoln and Hamlin voter; his younger brother, a Boston lawyer, who was a southern Democrat, a Breckinridge and Lane advocate; and to make the discussion more interesting, father himself was a Whig, a Bell and Everett man. The discussion waxed warmer and warmer. I was too young to understand the arguments of each, but I can remember the vehement manner and the loud voice with which each side was presented, separately at first, but the contest finally ended by all talking at once in the loudest tones possible. My dear mother felt then that it was time to interfere, or a crowd would collect outside the house; so in her quiet manner she went into the room, and

one by one shut the windows, and I think it ended then by "each one being of the same opinion still," but just as friendly as ever.

Father was for a number of years about this time a member of the Democratic Ward and City Committee. He served with such men as Thomas C. Amory, A. O. Brewster, Wyzeman Marshall, Prescott Barker, Joseph S. Fay, Abram Jackson, and others whose names were honored and respected at that time.

In December, 1869, he accepted the nomination for alderman, but was defeated the first year, but elected the next four consecutive years. I will close this chapter with a clipping which appeared in the *Boston Express*, Dec. 12, 1869:

"LEONARD R. CUTTER.—WARD 6.

"This gentleman is just the man the citizens should have as an alderman. He is conversant in all real estate matters and could benefit the city to a very great extent in the matter of its buildings and land. He has been placed in nomination by the Democrats, who recognize in him an exponent of their many great principles and who are determined that he shall occupy the honorable position of alderman in the city government. He is well known as a man of great integrity and business qualifications and will make an excellent alderman, and the nominating committee have done wisely in placing his name before the public. Another qualification is that Mr. Cutter is unswerving in purpose, and will not be swayed when the best interests and welfare of the city are to be considered. He possesses an appreciative judgment, indomitable perseverance and business tact. We feel assured that, if elected, he will give his energy and undivided attention to the best interests of the city. Mr. Cutter is one of our largest taxpayers, and has been well known from his many building enterprises at the West End, having in the last few years built several blocks and has been truly considered a public benefactor for building elegant and comfortable tenement houses for the laboring classes. One of his grand enterprises was in building on the old jail lands and improving the property in that neighborhood greatly. The voters of the West End will give him a rousing vote."

CHAPTER VI.

1870-1874.

In the fall of 1870 father was again on the ticket for alderman, and this time was elected, and for the next four years held the position of alderman. The following clipping from a Boston paper speaks for itself:

“LEONARD R. CUTTER.—WARD 6.

“Mr. Cutter is one of our heaviest real estate merchants, and a man thoroughly qualified for the position of alderman. His name is borne on the Democratic ticket. He is recognized by all as a most exemplary man and a successful merchant and will command the votes of all that feel an interest in the prosperity of the city. He is a gentleman who will not be swayed by any sinister motive whenever the interests of the city are to be considered. Mr. Cutter is one of our largest taxpayers, and has for many years been well known for his many building enterprises at the West End. Through his means a large number of tenement houses have been built during the past few years for the purpose of affording a cheap and comfortable residence for the working classes. This also shows his nature, and he deserves and will receive the votes of all laboring men who know him. It was he who a few years since improved the property and built on the old jail lands, an enterprise which increased the value of the property in that neighborhood to the amount of millions of dollars. A better nomination could not have been made. He should be elected by a rousing vote.”

He enjoyed the public life, but said that his business suffered from his inability to give all his time to it. In January, 1871, he commenced his labor at the City Hall, in connection with the following gentlemen: Mayor, William Gaston; Aldermen, Charles E. Jenkins, chairman, Robert Cowdin, Nehemiah Gibson, Edward A. White, George W. Pope, Henry L. Pierce, Avery Plumer, George D. Ricker, Samuel Talbot, Jr., William Woolley, Samuel Little.

He was appointed by the mayor on the following committees: Committee on Bridges, Aldermen Cutter, Gibson and Cowdin; Committee on County Accounts, Aldermen Little, Cowdin and Cutter; Committee on Jail, Aldermen Cutter, Pope and Talbot. On the Joint Standing Com-

mittees of City Council he was appointed on Assessors' Department with Aldermen Plumer and Ricker and other members of Common Council; Institution at South Boston and Deer Island, with Aldermen Jenkins and Gibson *et al.*; Mt. Hope Cemetery, with Alderman Talbot and others; Ordinances, with Aldermen Plumer and Woolley *et al.*; Public Lands, with Aldermen Pope and Talbot *et al.*

On Feb. 6, 1871, father made his first report. On Feb. 27 he took a stand against the report of his committee to elect a sixth assessor in the following minority report:

"The undersigned, a member of the committee of the Assessors' Department, respectfully dissents from the recommendation of the majority, believing that five persons are fully capable of performing all the duties required by the principal assessors, and that no change in the present system would be expedient at this time. L. R. CUTTER."

Having served as an assessor, he felt that he knew somewhat of the duties. He moved an indefinite postponement, the principal reason being expense. "The taxes of the city were enormous, and it was desirable they should not be increased." The motion was lost by five to six.

On April 10 the Salary Bill was taken up for consideration. With but few exceptions, father opposed all increase.

The order requesting badges for the City Council was defeated at this time by father and five of his associates, and the following comments appeared from the press:

"The purchase of costly badges for the members of the City Council, under the pretence that they are 'special policemen,' is one of a class of expenditures new in our city government, worse than needless in their character, dangerous as precedents, and demoralizing in their influence. Each year we have seen some new development of this character, some new extravagance, some new way of spending money for purposes that cannot be defended on tenable grounds. It is true that the cost of an excursion to Rocky Point or a few photographs of the members of a committee, handsomely framed, add but little to the rate of our taxation, but the indulgence in these luxuries at the expense of the city has a demoralizing effect, and many of the careless and reckless appropriations are due to these causes. With no intention to defraud the city, it is very hard for an alderman or councilman, after eating and drinking and frolicking with his fellow-members, to oppose a measure in which one or two of his associates take a deep interest, especially as they are profuse in their assurances that they have thoroughly investigated it and find it all right. The



JAFFREY ACADEMY.

members are more apt to act on their own judgment, and to take more time to investigate for themselves, if they retain their individuality, and avoid the entangling alliances that grow out of the efforts to establish good fellowship. As an entering wedge for a system of extravagant expenditures, the pioneer of a train of evil influences, we are glad to see that this order has thus far failed to pass the Board of Aldermen. For this the thanks of our citizens are due to Alderman Plumer and those who voted with him. In past years men who have been expected to stand up as champions of reform have yielded to the influences brought to bear upon them, to the great disappointment of their friends, but we feel assured that in the present board more than one man will be found who will not hesitate to carry out the expectations of our citizens, and oppose extravagance and waste in every form in which they may present themselves. And we are not without hopes that some of the gentlemen who have voted to adorn themselves with the badges of office, will ordinarily be found acting with them, and giving evidence by their votes that they have no hankering for official perquisites."

"The six aldermen who refused to vote in favor of taxing citizens to buy badges for members of the council, who wish to play policemen, have acted in accordance with the expectation of those voters who felt the necessity for reform in city expenditures, and elected a municipal government in December they believed would act in good faith in carrying out their views. The extravagance of former governments in personal indulgence, the gross and shameful excess to which it was carried in traveling, eating, drinking and general carousals, were topics of universal condemnation, and the people at the last election supposed they had chosen representatives who would not repeat the abuse complained of. In this they have not been totally deceived; yet there is a longing among many of the new government after decorations and fleshpots hard to resist; hence the effort of councilmen to adorn themselves with badges, and to indulge in those creature comforts furnished at the cost of the city treasury within a few rods of the City Hall. A committee convened a day or two since at a little past 1 o'clock P. M.—was in session a few minutes, passed one vote, and adjourned to Young's for dinner on municipal account. Another committee, about the same time, under similar circumstances, did the same thing, but without the assent or presence of the chairman, we believe, in either instance. If this indulgence is not checked at the outset, it will soon run into an excess equal to that of past years; those who have firmness and integrity enough to resist it will be accorded

the praise due good faith, whether they entirely succeed or not. We believe the city solicitor has given an opinion that the appointment of councilmen as special policemen has no legal sanction, and that their assumption of the authority is as unjustifiable as their demand for the insignia of the office is unbecoming their positions."

"Alderman Plumer and his associates deserve, and will receive, the thanks of their constituents for defeating the gold-badge humbug attempted by a majority of the Common Council, and we hope the reproof will be sufficient to keep the action of that body within the bounds of propriety for the remainder of the year."

"RIGHT.

"The Board of Aldermen, in confirming the members of the Common Council as special police officers on Tuesday, refused to vote them badges. There never was quite so absurd an expense as that involved in the outlay for these costly ornaments."

Alderman Plumer and father were the only two who voted against a contingent fund, the latter saying "it would be a useless expenditure simply to buy playthings with."

On August 4, 1871, the following was submitted to the Board of Aldermen:

"Ordered, That the Committee on Public Buildings be authorized to make such alterations to the Public Library building as may be necessary to provide additional shelving and working room, and to put in a steam-heating apparatus, at an estimated cost of fifty thousand dollars."

This order passed by a vote of eight to one, three aldermen being absent. Alderman Cutter was the only negative. In considering the subject, he expressed his astonishment at the amount of money the report proposed to lay out on an old building. He thought it hardly worth while, and ten thousand dollars he considered a very large sum to be expended for a heating apparatus.

In reply, Alderman Plumer said it could be built out in the rear to answer the requirements of the public for the next hundred years.

Alderman Cutter thought the government was advancing in its march of extravagant expenditure. Ten thousand for a mere heating apparatus and fifty thousand to patch up an old building were enormous expenditures, considering that that sum would complete an ordinary building.

Oct. 2, 1861, an order received from the Common Council for appointment of a joint special committee to receive and entertain the Grand Duke

Alexis of Russia and his suite upon their arrival in this city was considered.

Alderman Cutter said he could see no propriety in choosing committee to wait on dukes before they reach the country. It was possible the grand duke might not come, and the proper time for the appointment of a committee for his reception was when it was wanted. He moved the order be laid on the table, which was passed.

On Oct. 23, the Burrill claim of \$40,000 was discussed. Alderman Cutter was opposed to paying anything. Nov. 23, on motion of Alderman Cutter, the order to provide for the reception of the Grand Duke Alexis was taken from the table and passed, and Aldermen Jenkins, Cutter and Plumer were joined to the committee of the Common Council.

Nov. 27, 1871, an order to pay H.W. Paine, assignee of Charles Burrill, forty thousand dollars, in settlement of said Burrill claim against the city, was passed by a vote of eight to four. Alderman Cutter was one of the four; the others were Aldermen Gibson, Little and Plumer.

Dec. 26, 1871, the following remonstrance was presented, signed by thirty-seven leading citizens:

"To His Honor the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Boston: The undersigned beg leave to remonstrate against the cutting down of the trees in front of the Granary burying-ground."

Alderman Pierce offered an order to rescind the order directing the cutting down of the trees in question. Alderman Cutter said he was in favor of retaining the trees in the walk so long as the burying-ground remained there. There was room enough to walk six abreast, and there was no inconvenience from the trees. He hoped the order would pass. But it was rejected by a vote of three yeas to seven nays. Yeas: Aldermen Cutter, Jenkins and Pierce.

In the discussion of contingent fund and expenditure of committee, Alderman Cutter said he was one of those who were in favor of putting a stop to such squandering of the public money. There was a class of men who get into the city government solely for the dinners and rides, and the way to get rid of them was to lay on the table all such bills for expenditures. The Committee on Ordinances and the Committee on Dressed Meat, on which he had served, had made no such expenditures. If the auditor was called upon to report such expenditures every month, it would do much to prevent its continuance. So far as related to eating hearty dinners before engaging in public business, he did not believe the man could be in a proper condition to do the business after such eating.

Alderman Pope said he was glad the discussion arose, for it appeared that the expenditures had been twenty thousand dollars less than last year.

Thus ended the first year of his aldermanic duties. He was called, and quite justly, "the watchdog of the treasury."

Father was re-elected in the fall of 1871, and in January, 1872, entered upon his second term with the following associates: Mayor, William Gaston; Aldermen, Samuel Little, chairman, Moses Fairbanks, George D. Ricker, William Woolley, Thomas L. Jenks, Sidney Squires, William Sayward, Stephen A. Stackpole, John T. Clark, William C. Poland, James Power.

He served on the following committees: Committee on Bridges, Aldermen Cutter, Stackpole and Squires; Committee on Markets, Weights and Measures, Aldermen Fairbanks, Stackpole and Cutter; Committee on Paving, Aldermen Little, Cutter and Power; Committee on Police, Aldermen Cutter, Clark and Fairbanks.

On Joint Standing Committee of City Council he was appointed on Assessors' Department with Aldermen Ricker, Stackpole and others; Claims, with Aldermen Jenks, Little and others of the Common Council; Fire Department, with Aldermen Woolley, Clark and others; Institutions at South Boston and Deer Island, with Aldermen Ricker, Jenks and others; Ordinances, with Aldermen Jenks and Squires and others; Overseers of the Poor, with Alderman Sayward and others; Public Library, with Aldermen Jenks, Stackpole and others; Joint Special Committee of both branches he was appointed on Suffolk Street and Church Street District with Aldermen Little, Squires and others; Salaries of City Officers, with Alderman Stackpole and others; International Musical Festival, with Aldermen Jenks, Clark, Sayward, Poland and eight of the Common Council.

On Jan. 8, 1872, Alderman Cutter offered the following order:

"Ordered, That the order passed Dec. 18, 1871, authorizing and directing the superintendent of streets to remove the trees standing in the sidewalk on Tremont Street opposite the Granary burying-ground be rescinded."

Petitions for rescinding the order were presented from Massachusetts Horticultural Society, Josiah Quincy, Edward S. Rand, Albert Lawrence and others; also from H. H. Coolidge, S. M. Quincy and others, officers and members of the Union Club, H. P. Kidder and others, J. Ingersoll Bowditch and others, and from James Freeman Clarke and

others. The order was read once and laid over, and the petitions were laid on the table.

On Jan. 15 it was moved and carried to refer the order for rescinding to the Committee on Paving.

On Jan. 29 Alderman Cutter was elected a member of the Cochituate Water Board.

On March 11, 1872, the Salary Bill was considered by sections, which were severally adopted without objections, until that portion was reached relating to the pay of police officers, on which an increase was reported. On section four of the fourth order the salary of the captains of police was fixed at fifteen hundred dollars a year, increased from four dollars per day.

Alderman Cutter, in opposing this section, said he believed in doing the city's business as he would his own; and if he had men in his employment who made a strike when there were two thousand ready to take their places at their pay, he would employ the latter. The salaries paid the officers were not small, but good pay, and it was proposed to make an increase of ninety-three dollars. It was sufficient to make men change their vocations to get it. He would remind the gentlemen that he was elected on a reform ticket, which did not mean an increase of pay. Let the aldermen look at the burden of taxation, which was driving away rich men from the city; and yet it was proposed to increase it by sixty thousand dollars. As he wished for economy in his own business, he should adopt a like policy for the city. The motion to substitute four dollars a day, the present pay, for fifteen hundred dollars, was carried by a vote of eight to four.

On May 27 the order requesting the trustees of the Public Library to open the reading-room of the library and permit the use of books and periodicals therein on Sunday from ten till nine P. M., was considered. Alderman Cutter said he trusted the board would not be hasty, for it was a very important matter. The order was postponed at this meeting.

On June 4, 1872, the subject of opening the Public Library on Sunday was taken up and given a public hearing. Remonstrances were presented from a large number of the Christian churches of Boston. Edward Everett Hale spoke in favor of it. Ezra Farnsworth spoke against it, and said that the city solicitor had given his opinion five years ago that it would be a violation of the law. The hearing for that day was closed.

On June 10 the subject was brought up again. Alderman Clark opened the question by an address to the board. At its close Alderman

Cutter said he had no written speech to read, for his style needed no written speech. The proposed action was a step in advance of what the community had tolerated, and he begged them to pause before they authorized the opening of the doors of the Public Library on the Sabbath. The Christianity and the morals of a community were known by the way of keeping the Sabbath. This subject had been discussed before, and the question of its legality was well known, the fact of the doubt being the reason for a petition to the Legislature for a change in the law for the right to open the library on the Sabbath.

The proposed action was in the face and eyes of the community and of the churches, and he asked, Is it judicious in their face to overrun the law and vote against the convictions of the best class of the community? The middling classes, he contended, were the best classes, and they had not asked for the opening of the Public Library; it was asked by rich Unitarian churches, who do not want it for themselves and do not need it, but for those who do not darken their doors on the Sabbath. That the poor and middling classes do not want it, was shown by the vote at the Tremont Temple of every man, woman and child against it. To ask for the passage of such a measure in opposition to the wishes of the best half of the community was in bad taste, and he trusted that the order would not be passed. The order was passed by a vote of six to four.

The locating of the smallpox hospital, the Metropolitan Railroad stable, the site for new court house, the English High and Latin school-houses all came up before the board during the year, and a great deal of discussion took place; my father always voted upon these questions from an economical basis.

On Nov. 10 of this year took place the great fire, which necessitated prompt and immediate action from the city government. While the fire was raging my father stood and watched it from the dome of the City Hall, expecting every moment to see it cross Washington Street and make a swift approach to the City Hall itself. All the public documents were ready to be moved under the old reservoir at a moment's notice.

On Nov. 11, 1872, at a special meeting called at ten o'clock in the morning on account of the fire, the following motion was made by Alderman Cutter:

"Resolved, That the thanks of the City Council be tendered to the members of our own fire department, and also to the companies and individuals from other towns and places, for the valuable aid and assistance rendered to this city in its present calamity; and that the committee of the

Fire Department be authorized to furnish such accommodations and refreshments as may be found necessary for their comfort."

At the regular meeting of the board on the afternoon of Nov. 11 the following order was presented by Alderman Woolley:

"Ordered, That the city messenger be directed to furnish suitable badges for the Board of Aldermen, the expense to be charged to the appropriation for incidentals."

Alderman Cutter believed that in these times they should study economy in not expending money for badges. Alderman Ricker said he felt a necessity for a badge on the night of the fire. Alderman Cutter said if the object was simply to pass the line, a five-dollar badge was as good as a fifty-dollar one, and when so much money was spent for such a purpose it was an injustice to the taxpayers. The order was passed, amended to provide for their payment from the contingent fund of the Board of Aldermen.

At the last meeting of the year, Jan. 4, 1873, on motion of Alderman Cutter:

"Ordered, That the thanks of this board are due to our esteemed associate, Samuel Little, for the satisfactory manner in which he had filled the laborious position of chairman of the board, and we assure him that he carries into retirement the sincere respect and esteem of his associates for his fidelity to duty, and for honesty of purpose which has characterized his conduct during the last year."

Alderman Cutter addressed the board in support of the above resolution, in which he said it expressed the true sentiment of his heart, and he was satisfied that it did also that of all his associates. The chairman had been distinguished for his promptness, fidelity, honesty, and for the ability with which he had discharged his duties, having been present at all times in the meetings of committees and neglecting no duties in the situation in which he has been placed.

A clipping from the *Peterboro' Transcript* relating to the city government of 1872 is here inserted, also the following letter, which will speak for itself of the faithful work done while serving the city:

My dear Sir:

Boston, Mass., May 23, 1872.

I owe you an apology, and therefore frankly proffer it. Referring to the case of — —, whose application for appointment upon the Boston police is before you, I have to say that he has borne an irreproachable character for several years past; that this record has earned him the en-

dorsement of many influential citizens of our community; and that for these reasons I recently pressed upon you strongly his claims to a position upon the police force.

I now learn, much to my surprise and chagrin, that, prior to the year 1864, he had committed offences against the State for which he was incarcerated in a penal institution.

I will thank you, therefore, to express to your associates upon the committee my regrets at having endeavored to influence their action in ——— behalf, and also my gratification that such thoroughness of investigation exists on the part of your committee in regard to police appointments as renders the interference of outsiders unnecessary.

Very respectfully,

W. A. SIMMONS.

Leonard R. Cutter, Esq., chairman of Committee on Police, Boston.

"The Boston *Courier*, in a recent article upon 'The City Government' of Boston, says that by far the larger part of its members who were born outside of the State are natives of New Hampshire. Two of the present Board of Aldermen were formerly natives of this section. We clip the following from the article:

"Moses Fairbanks was a member of the Board of Aldermen in the years 1868-1869. He is about fifty-five years of age, and was born in Peterboro', N. H. For a number of years he has been a member of the well-known firm of Fairbanks & Beard, dealers in bottled ale, soda, etc., under the Howard Athenæum. He was elected on the Republican and Mercantile Hall tickets.

"Leonard R. Cutter, as appears by his assessment, is the most wealthy member of the present board. He is a self-made man with every qualification for the office. He is a native of Jaffrey, N. H., and is about forty-six years of age. During the past year he has proved by his extensive knowledge of real estate a most useful and worthy member, devoting much of his time to the interests and welfare of the city. Politically he has long been identified with the Democratic party.'

"When Mr. Cutter left Jaffrey in 1845, one of its prominent citizens remonstrated against his leaving the homestead, and pictured the folly of seeking his fortune in a new field. To-day, in the prime of life, Mr. Cutter has accumulated a fortune much larger than that of his adviser, now an old man, who started with \$5,000 at the age of twenty-one. Mr. Cutter's property is mostly in real estate, valued, according to the assessor's record, at about \$260,000. Would he have done better on the farm?"

In the fall of 1872 my father was re-elected, for the second time, an alderman. The following notice appeared in the press at that time:

“LEONARD R. CUTTER.—WARD 6.

“It is gratifying to know that Mr. Cutter, who has been a most efficient member of the Board of Aldermen for the past two years, has been put in nomination for another term. Mr. Cutter is well known as a man of large business capacity and one who takes a deep interest in the welfare of the city. His taxable property amounts to over \$300,000, and his large business interests in the city proper make him just the man to hold the position of one of the fathers of the city government. As chairman of the Committee on Police for the past year, he has shown himself peculiarly qualified, and to him is due much of the credit of the efficiency and faithfulness shown in that department. He has served faithfully and arduously on many other committees, and in a manner which has met with the approval of all good citizens. He is calm and cool in the performance of any duty conferred upon him, never doing anything without due consideration. This peculiar trait in his character makes him just the man for the position of alderman. His fidelity to the city's interest is firm and unflinching, looking as he does to the greatest good to the largest number. We have no doubt of his triumphant re-election.”

The following gentlemen were associated with him in the Board of Aldermen for 1873: Mayor, Henry L. Pierce; Aldermen, John T. Clark, Nehemiah Gibson, James Power, Charles Hulbert, Samuel M. Quincy, Solomon B. Stebbins, William Sayward, John Brown, Alanson Bigelow, Hiram Emery, Thomas Gaffield.

Alderman Cutter served this year on the following committees: Committee on Bridges, Aldermen Cutter, Gibson and Power; Committee on Paving, Aldermen Cutter, Power and Hulbert; Committee on Police, Aldermen Gibson, Cutter and Clark; Committee on Assessors' Department, Aldermen Brown, Cutter and Stebbins; Committee on Claims, Aldermen Cutter, Gaffield and Quincy; Committee on Engineer's Department, Aldermen Bigelow and Cutter; Committee on Fire Department, Aldermen Cutter, Clark and Stebbins; Committee on Institutions at South Boston and Deer Island, Aldermen Hulbert, Power and Cutter; Committee on Ordinances, Aldermen Quincy, Bigelow and Cutter; Committee on Public Instruction, Aldermen Gaffield, Sayward and Cutter.

At the first meeting of Jan. 6, 1873, Alderman Cutter was unanimously elected chairman. On taking his seat he said: “Gentlemen of

the Board of Aldermen,—For the kindness and confidence shown in selecting me as the chairman of this board I beg you to accept my grateful acknowledgments. I properly appreciate the high trust and the responsibility imposed, as well as the honor conferred by it. Confidently relying upon your co-operation, without which it will be impossible to hope for success, I accept the situation with a most earnest desire and a fixed determination to administer its functions, so far as I may be able, in such a manner that our deliberations may be pleasing to ourselves and profitable to our city. Gentlemen, I await your pleasure.”

As I examine the meetings of the board I find my father present and presiding at every meeting of the board during the year.

On Jan. 20 Alderman Cutter was again elected a member of the Cochituate Water Board.

On Jan. 27 the order to request the trustees of the Public Library to open the reading-room of the library on Sundays from 2 to 9 P. M., which had been referred to the Joint Standing Committee on the Public Library, was reported upon to the effect that the order ought to pass. There was some discussion, it being very strongly opposed by Alderman Hulbert, but it was passed finally.

On Feb. 10 orders were considered and discussed relating to refreshments and carriage hire, with the object of checking growing abuses.

On March 17 of this year the report of the Cochituate Water Board on an additional supply of water was presented to the board.

During the meetings in May the subject of baseball playing on the Common was discussed in a very animated way by different aldermen. As my father occupied the chair, no remarks from him were in order.

On July 28 the question relating to the Boston Normal School and the payment of its teachers was considered. The committee reported: In the month of April an order was passed to provide room in the Rice School Building for the use of the Normal School, which order was vetoed by the mayor on May 1, in accordance with the opinion of the city solicitor that its city government has no authority to establish a normal school, such schools being already established and supported by the State government in different parts of the Commonwealth. Under this decision the school after May 1 had no longer any legal existence, and the engagements made by the School Committee with the teachers of said school for one year were rendered null and void. But as the teachers were not aware of this illegality of their appointments, it was not considered equitable to cut off their salaries at once, and the government

ordered them to be paid up to the first of June. Eight months of the year only had passed when the school was declared illegal, and the teachers have been paid for nine months of service. The order under consideration contemplates their payment for the remaining three months of the year. The School Committee, in the face of the mayor's veto, not only kept the Normal School in operation after May 1, but have re-elected the head master for another year. Your committee propose to abide by the decision of the city solicitor and its logical results, until set aside by the Supreme Court, and therefore recommend that the order ought not to pass.

During the discussion Alderman Cutter, having called Alderman Gibson to the chair, said:

"The alderman [who had previously spoken] has stated the question differently from what it really is. When this subject was first before the board, I think the alderman asked the question if they were coming in here for more pay, and was answered that they were not. Now they come again. The teachers are not hired for a year. They do not receive any pay after they are discharged. And if they are hired by the year, it is for the financial year, which begins on the first of May. Therefore they are not entitled to pay for services, because they have not rendered any, because the pay would not be due till the first of September. But in the face and eyes of the veto of the mayor, it isn't judicious to pay them in advance for their services. It will be no use to pass this bill, for the mayor will veto it, as it will be his duty to do. I don't think it would be best for this board to put itself in an illegal position. I think the gentleman has been put up to fever heat on this subject by the School Committee, who on the first of July re-elected the teachers for the Normal School, notwithstanding its illegality. I don't propose to gratify the School Committee in this by taking money from the treasury to support an illegal school."

The report was accepted by a vote of ten to two.

On Aug. 20, 1873, took place in Jaffrey, N. H., my father's birthplace, the centennial celebration of the town. Upon invitation, a number of the government accompanied father to Jaffrey and spent the day with him. The following notices were cut from the papers:

"A PLEASANT OCCASION.—On Friday last the mayor and aldermen of Boston and a few other gentlemen dined with Mr. Leonard R. Cutter at his beautiful summer residence in East Jaffrey. The party paid a visit to the birthplace of Mr. Cutter, near the foot of Monadnock Mountain,

which he left in 1845 to seek his fortune in our New England metropolis, where he has been prosperous to a good degree, and while accumulating a large store of this world's goods, has maintained the integrity and uprightness of character which renders him an honored and influential citizen. He is now a member of the Board of Aldermen. After a sumptuous dinner and a pleasant social hour, the party returned to the city by the 3.30 train, feeling that a great deal of enjoyment had been experienced in a short space of time. The courtesies of the Monadnock & Boston, Clinton & Fitchburg Railroads were extended to the company, and a special car provided for their convenience."—*Peterboro', N. H., Transcript*.

"Resonant cheers were given as Boston 'men of high degree' filed in at 11.30 A. M., and took seats upon the platform, after a pertinent introduction by President Franklin Cutter. The party included Mayor Henry L. Pierce, Alderman L. R. Cutter (chairman of the board, who was the host), Aldermen Gibson, Brown and Sayward; John A. Haven, president, and Nathaniel J. Bradlee, ex-president of Cochituate Water Board; Alfred T. Turner, auditor of accounts; Joseph Davis, city surveyor; H. A. Blood, superintendent of the Boston, Clinton & Fitchburg Railroad; President Howe, of the Bedford & Taunton Railroad, and four companionable reporters representing the *Boston Post, News, Globe* and *Advertiser*."

The introduction was as follows:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

As our friends from Boston can remain with us only a short time, we propose to defer dinner until half-past one; therefore I now introduce to you C. A. Parks, Esq., of East Jaffrey, as toastmaster of the day.

TOASTMASTER PARKS'S REMARKS.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow-Citizens of Jaffrey:

We are honored to-day by Boston, in the presence here of her mayor and her Board of Aldermen, a body of gentlemen whose position distinguishes them as Boston's most worthy representatives. A sentiment has been selected for the honorable mayor, suggestive not only of the geographical proximity of New Hampshire to the city over which he presides, but also of that honest gratitude and pride over Boston's high rank and increasing greatness as a metropolis, in which Jaffrey may be permitted to share through those of her sons she has given the great city to enroll among her honored names. It is this: "Jaffrey enjoys the honor of not being entirely outside that circle of which Boston is the

centre and the 'Hub.' And she is justly proud of the distinction which New England's largest city has in the past given to many of her sons." I have the honor of presenting to you the Honorable Henry L. Pierce, mayor of Boston.

MAYOR PIERCE'S RESPONSE.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I did not come up here to-day to address you, or, indeed, with any desire to do so. In fact, I shrink from making an address. But I came on the invitation of my friend, Alderman Cutter, whom Boston knows and respects, to meet with you on this day so interesting to you and all of us. The close of a century in the history of the world, the close of the present century, is one of the most interesting and among the most eventful of any that have marked the progress of the race. When we look back and see what has been accomplished in the world, and even in this country, and see that during that time we have separated from the British crown, and observe the improvements that have been made and which affect the welfare of the world at large, we must look back upon it with the greatest satisfaction. But we must also look forward, and hope that the century to come will be crowned with equal results. Boston is proud of being considered the metropolis of New England, and she desires to express her hearty thanks for the many good, sound men who have been sent to her from New Hampshire, and who have helped to increase her prosperity. She hopes she is worthy of what New England has made her in the past, and she hopes to be worthy of the support of New England in the future. And now, ladies and gentlemen, I will only say I thank you all, and thank my friend, the son of Jaffrey, the alderman, for the pleasure he has given me in inviting us to be present on this occasion.

Sentiment No. 2: "We welcome those who, having gone from us, have aided in sustaining the character of the noble sons of New Hampshire for integrity, enterprise and success in business in every part of our land." Having read the above sentiment, the toastmaster introduced the next speaker: I have the pleasure of presenting to you, as a respondent to this sentiment, a gentleman of whom nothing need be said by me. He is known to you all. His native town is Jaffrey, where he is always warmly welcomed. In Boston, where he has resided a number of years, he is noted as a gentleman eminently successful in business, and one whom his adopted city has delighted to honor for his superior

ability and sterling integrity. I refer to the Honorable Leonard R. Cutter, chairman of the Board of Aldermen of Boston.

ALDERMAN CUTTER'S RESPONSE.

You do me great honor, Mr. President, in asking me to respond to the sentiment just read. I sincerely regret that I am not better qualified to do justice to the subject. I can truly say that whatever success has attended the efforts of those sons of New Hampshire who have sought fame or fortune in other States and other countries has been largely due to the honorable distinction in which their birthplace is held. The old-fashioned standard of morality and integrity has been so nobly maintained by those who have remained at home that the wanderers carry with them a certificate of good character in the name of the State from which they hail, and that goes a great way in assuring them success, even among the Philistines. While our State has not, for obvious reasons, increased so rapidly in wealth and population during the last fifty years as some other sections of the country, it certainly has not fallen behind any section in those things which tend to a higher state of civilization, good government and right living; and in the meantime it has been furnishing, in larger proportions, I believe, than any other New England State, the intelligent enterprise which has, as it were, annihilated time and distance, and enabled us to do our missionary work in the far West, and at the same time keep good hours at home. There is one advantage, Mr. President, which we who go away from home have over those who stay, and that is the pleasure of returning; and we also acquire a keener appreciation of the natural beauties of our native place. Although I spent my youth here in the shadow of old Monadnock, I never knew or imagined the grandeur of the scenery I was daily looking upon until I had an opportunity of comparing it with other places. There is something ennobling in the presence of this scenery beyond the power of any works of man. And, living in these Pacific Railroad times, it is a sort of satisfaction to reflect that the works of nature here are upon such a gigantic scale that the profaning hands of railroad contractors are almost powerless against them. But, Mr. President, the occasion on which we have met brings up other scenes and other events than those which are merely amusing or ridiculous. We have this day together turned our eyes back upon the places which knew us in our infancy and youth. To us New Hampshire presents something other than her granite hills; yes, sir, and something more interesting even than the

grassy vales, or the pearly brooks, or the silvery water-sheets, that are associated with past time of our early days. Dearer to us still than the imagery of those bright scenes is the memory of the friends that we first loved,—those who nurtured us in infancy, who guided us in youth, who opened to us the avenues of knowledge, who warned us of the miseries of vice and presented to us the inducements of virtue, and who made us what we are. Perhaps they still live to greet our occasional returns to the paternal home; or perhaps we have been called to commit them to the silent bosom of earth. Be that as it may, our relation to them is sacred; and while the power of thought shall endure the memory of their kindness will abide. In conclusion, Mr. President, I give you a sentiment (and I do not expect any one to respond to it unless the old man of the mountain should happen to be present): “The hills of New Hampshire. If Napoleon could incite his soldiers to greater deeds of valor by the thought that forty centuries looked down upon them from the pyramids, how much greater should be the inspiration and the achievement of the sons of New Hampshire from the thought that the centuries from the beginning of time look down upon them from their native hills.”

Rev. Moses Runnels, a Jaffrey boy and a fellow student with my father, from whom I received a sketch of my father's boyhood, which was given in an earlier chapter, has written the following:

“Nearly thirty years had passed over our heads since we last met. I had never seen Mr. Cutter in the meantime, though frequently hearing of his success, when, on Aug. 20, 1873, our third scene must be laid and confined to a single day—Jaffrey's great gala day, the centennial celebration of her incorporation as a town. A large tent was spread upon the Common. The sons of Jaffrey from far and near, in every direction, had assembled. But among the most distinguished arrivals that day we were permitted to observe, was that of the then mayor of Boston and all the City Council, under the escort of Hon. Leonard R. Cutter as one of the aldermen.

“The dreams of his youth had been realized. He had been successful in business, and was now a gentleman of wealth and most honorable standing. He had purchased, for a summer resort, the old stone mansion, near East Jaffrey village, which had been built by J. M. Melville, Esq., the founder of Melville Academy, where we attended school together. This house, in the days of our schooling, was owned and occupied by Mr. Melville, and for many years was acknowledged to be the most costly, substantial and imposing dwelling-house in town. To this

summer retreat of his, on that centennial day, Mr. Cutter had invited his friend, the mayor of Boston, and his associates, other members of the Board of Aldermen, for entertainment. His speech in the pavilion that day was a model for appropriateness, modesty, brevity and comprehensiveness."

On Sept. 29, 1873, Alderman Quincy, from the Joint Committee on Ordinances, submitted the majority and minority reports of the committee on the subject of the revision of the city charter. L. R. Cutter, Benjamin Dean and T. J. Dacy were the signers of the minority report.

On Oct. 9 the subject of a fire commissioner came before the board. Alderman Gibson took the chair and Alderman Cutter spoke most earnestly against commissions as follows:

"I have the high honor, Mr. Chairman, of being the chairman of the committee on the fire department, and have thought that at this particular stage of proceedings I might be indulged in a few remarks on this subject. I had supposed that my associates were honest enough to speak what they believe, and that they believed our fire department equal in strength and equal in power to do to-day more than it has been able to do any day since the charter of the city was granted. We have improved it this year. We were found fault with by the underwriters, who held up their hands and said we were doing nothing. We were not spending money enough. Then we bought four new engines, and organized four new companies for the city proper, which will cost Boston \$150,000 a year. And I tell you, gentlemen, the taxpayers have got something to say about this.

"The underwriters can control some men, perhaps, but they cannot control the votes of the taxpayers, and it is the taxpayers who are going to control this question. So far as this board undertaking to shuffle their duties off upon a body of commissioners and taxing the people to pay them is concerned, I think they will say that a different class of gentlemen is needed here, who will perform these duties without any shuffling. I did expect that this city government would not be led like the Federal and State governments into commission after commission, until we have so many officeholders that we cannot vote to turn out a president because, in spite of you, he can elect himself through his own agency. I didn't suppose this state of things would come from a republican form of government. Now, I say the nearer you bring these things to the people, the better it will be for the taxpayers of the city.

"The gentleman from the Highland district says, without qualifica-



LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE TWENTY.

tion, that we have excellent heads of departments in this city, and when in this board the question came on voting for chief engineer, he had the manly independence to cast a blank vote. He is welcome to all the glory he can gain from a cartridge of that dimension. I never fire blank cartridges, but do my duties as best I can, and this is my third consecutive year in this body. My first fight was against adorning the members with badges costing \$40 each, paid for by the people's money. And the mayor whom we have elected was presented by the board with one costing \$50. Gentlemen, I have labored for the taxpayers of this city, and have been affected somewhat in the rates of taxation.

"There was no fault found with the fire department until this unfortunate fire came upon us. And do you undertake to lay that to the department? The horses were all sick; was that the fault of the department? The gentleman who occupies the chair was right when he said it was worth \$10,000 to manage that fire. It got into a lot of lumber sheds built upon storehouses and insured as first-class risks, and when the fire got into those sheds, like that covering yonder hotel, do you think it was in the power of the department to stop it? The gentleman from the Highland district says it was here that the department failed, where it should not have failed. Well, what did the chief of the fire department do? The citizens came here and held a meeting, and what did they recommend? They wanted something besides water used. They wanted powder, and I believe they would have mobbed him then and there if he had refused them. But what did the chief say? He said—and I must confess I never had so much respect for him as I have had since—he said: 'Gentlemen, I don't approve of using powder.' But they did use powder, and he consented to it. The question then came, 'How are you going to use it?' Well, each alderman must take a keg under his arm and lug it out into the street. Said I: 'Gentlemen, I am not in the habit of using powder in such quantities as that.' The gentlemen went down there and used powder, and came up the next day and thought they had done some great thing by it.

"Two thousand petitioners asked us to enforce the prohibitory law; but we didn't do it. But if the papers had demanded of us as they have in relation to the fire department, somebody would have taken a back track. That is the difficulty we labor under. Gentlemen, if there is a spark of value in the republican form of government, never, never destroy this sovereignty that the people should always have and enjoy. Nothing remaining, however potent, would balance that. I can say to

you as I did last fall, that I had paid my respects to the people at City Hall, and they could pay theirs to me at the polls. They worked against me, and I said, Gentlemen, you have the right to do so. But I want to tell you, gentlemen, that if you stand up here and take an independent stand and not fear the fire department or the people, you will gain, as I have every year, more than 2,500 votes. Of the gentlemen who voted upon the increased pay of the police, only those four who voted against it are here to-day. So you need not fear. You need not take a back track in these things. Stand up and maintain what you know to be right. Never fail to maintain it. Under any circumstances never miss that. That is the policy my experience teaches.

"I trust we shall not put an imperfect thing in here to hasten through. I will agree to insure your property for the next twenty-four hours. It has been said that certain insurance offices have proposed to leave this city because our department is so weak. I wish to show you a statement. I own some houses in this city. They have volunteered to send it to me. I didn't go to them. They have offered to insure my property at less than I have been able to obtain it for the last ten years. Here are their figures, and they stand by them. Where I have paid \$1.50 for five years, they offer to do it for one dollar in as good offices as you can find in State Street. Where I have paid \$2.50, they offer to take \$2. Where I have paid \$1.75, they offer to take \$1. The gentleman from Ward 3 undertook to make us believe here that the insurance companies would not insure in the city. Well, now they are a little in by this fire. They have learned that first-class risks do not consist in mercantile houses closed up from Saturday afternoon till Monday morning. These men have profited by the ability of the fire department. They have been fattening and paying twenty per cent dividends right along. A gentleman connected with an insurance office said that he lost \$60,000 which he had before the fire; he might have divided all the dividends in his office and pocketed \$60,000, and he wished he had done it. Now, sir, if they undertake to dictate to us how to manage our fire department and make our citizens pay for it; if they calculate to shake the bush for them to catch the bird, I tell you that won't go down in this city. If you do it this year, you will abolish it next. The gentleman from the Highland district undertakes to doubt the military discipline of the fire department. He is the last man I would go to, to learn military. He is the last man to whom I would go to learn what is necessary for the fire department; a man who has not crossed the threshold of the fire department office this

year. And he undertakes to talk here with a written speech manufactured by insurance agents, in my judgment, if you will allow me, and to tell us what is needed and what is to be done. We have been at work in there. We have had our coats off. You, my friends, will bear with me that we have time and again sought information concerning our department ever since we have been on that committee. You undertake to tell me that the mayor is better capable of appointing a good commission than a committee. Perhaps the present mayor is, but he is not going to be the next mayor. I tell you the mayor and the president of the Common Council have been more to blame than any other two persons in this city for placing upon the fire department committee men of extravagant notions. There was a certain gentleman placed on that committee who resigned because he could not do as he wanted. He was a gentleman worthy to sit on that committee. I tell you it was no duty of his to resign. But when he had resigned, another gentleman went in there, and you know his record. I tell you that is the fault of the mayor of Boston and the president of the Common Council, and of nobody else. If you undertake to place the responsibility upon them, look out that you are not hanged with the rope that you have manufactured yourselves. I believe the fire department, as a department, has never been forced into any political use to govern any other department. But there is not an alderman outside of the city proper that does not show a little inclination to favor his political locality. But I tell you that when you blame the fire department for favoring their own interests, you blame them when you should not. But as regards this last fire being a bugbear, I would rather risk my buildings to-day without any insurance at all than to have a commission appointed and keep up a running fire every twenty-four hours; for I tell you, gentlemen, if you don't have fires their mission is gone. The fires must exist. But many of them would not occur if insurance men would insure property as they do in Paris; that is, if fire originates among your own goods, you get no insurance; but is it in your neighbor's, and yours are destroyed, you receive it. That would teach you to look out for your own goods and houses. But now, if a gentleman comes to Boston to set up in business, he will get trusted for goods for, perhaps, \$2,000; he then gets insured for \$5,000, and when he gets in a tight place the building gets on fire. I don't say who sets it, but I do say somebody is induced to set it. It is the insurance companies that do these things. They sit in their nice offices, and don't look at the man or his goods. They take his statement and his money, and that is all. I beg of you, gentlemen, to believe that you have an engineer and a fire

department just as good and better than is to be found in any city of this Union to-day. I shall vote against commissions. I shall decidedly object to voting for a commission on the fire department. You don't need it any more than you need one on public buildings or any other department. Since you have had a commission on streets, what an amount of money have you spent on their account! And if you didn't spend it, their mission would pass away. We had to nearly strip them of their powers after we elected them. The commission on health, you, gentlemen, perhaps in a year and perhaps in less time, will believe with me that it is an expensive affair. They don't purify the air. They sit in their offices and employ sixteen or twenty assistants to do what has been done during the last year. They went to work and seized the Marcella Street Hospital. Well, they are welcome to that. They have destroyed other buildings; then they have destroyed a most excellent neighborhood and driven our citizens from it to place our smallpox patients there when we had ample room for them, and when this had been done and the papers had stopped saying anything about it, the smallpox was abolished."

On Oct. 13 the revision of the city charter was considered. Alderman Gibson in the chair, Alderman Cutter said:

"I have a seat in Committee on Ordinances. The gentleman signs his report 'For the Committee,' but not for the majority of the committee. I have never had this matter committed to me, and I think it is due to this committee that it be recommitted. I don't think we should adopt a report of a committee without its having been adopted by the committee. We didn't see any argument for changing the city charter. If we appoint the commission, we have got to pay them. As we enlarge the city, we shall, of course, have to amend the ordinances, but I don't believe in wiping out the charter prepared by Judge Shaw, and I don't see any reason for appointing a commission to change the ordinances, because there is no reason why there should be a change at this particular time. The only reason that I heard was that the Committee on Paving should be a joint committee. Now I don't believe we can carry eight men around every day to look after our duties. Such a committee would be cumbersome, useless and paralyzed. It is due to the members of this committee that this subject should be recommitted to them, and they should have a chance to read the report and understand it before it is produced here."

On Oct. 20 the additional water supply came up for consideration, and the following order was passed:

"Ordered, That the Cochituate Water Board, as the agent of the city

of Boston, be and it is hereby directed to take, hold and convey to, into and through said city all the water of Sudbury River, so called, said water to be taken at any point or points within the town of Framingham, or higher up on said river, and the water of Farm Pond so called, in said town of Framingham, and the water which may flow into and from said river and pond, and to take any water rights in or upon said river or pond, in or above the town of Framingham, or connected therewith. Said Cochituate Water Board is also hereby directed, as the agents of this city, to take and hold by purchase or otherwise, in connection with said sources of supply, any lands and real estate necessary for increasing or preserving the purity of the water, or for laying, building or maintaining aqueducts, water courses, reservoirs, dams, buildings, machinery and other structures and appliances, with their accessories, for conducting, elevating, purifying, storing, discharging, disposing of and distributing water; and also to take and hold any land (excepting any land in Framingham heretofore taken or purchased by any railroad company) on the margin of said sources of supply not exceeding five rods in width from the high-water line of said river, storage reservoirs or pond, so far as may be necessary, in the opinion of said Water Board, for the preservation and purity of the same, for the purpose of furnishing a supply of pure water to the city of Boston. The expense of the taking of said waters and lands aforesaid to be charged to appropriation already existing therefor."

During the discussion Alderman Cutter, having called Alderman Gibson to the chair, said:

"The necessity of passing this order is owing to the neglect of its not being done before. It was an oversight of the Water Board. Recently they discovered that they needed this authority. It is no new thing. There is no question but that we need water, and we can't get it from Cochituate Lake. We have annexed Brighton and West Roxbury, and will probably annex Brookline, all of which will want to be supplied with water. I am fearful that Sudbury River will not be sufficient to supply us with water if we go on laying pipes in the towns annexed, and if they use water as freely as Dorchester and Roxbury have done. We shall need a very large supply. It is well known that during a dry time every man who has a little garden or yard uses the hose freely. It doesn't become us to economize on this subject of procuring a water supply, but it does become us to go on and get all the water that we need."

On Nov. 4 the salaries of the fire commissioners came up for decision.

True to his convictions, Alderman Cutter left the chair to Alderman Gibson and said:

"I had the honor of being chairman of the committee on salaries in 1872. We had before us the salary of the Board of Health, which we thought should not exceed those of the street commissioners. I didn't see why they should. We don't expect every commission to be made up any better than the street commissioners are. We pay them \$3,500 a year, and we know what a hustling about there is when the office is vacant. It was desired by the mayor, last year, that we pay the health commissioners \$5,000, but who of us believes if we had, that we should have improved that commission? Haven't the press extolled the health commissioners for doing their duty without favor or fear? I must agree with the gentleman in saying I don't see what the fire commissioners have got to do. All that they have got to do is to sit there and send their subordinates about to see what is necessary to be done. I agree with him that it is time economy put salaries where they belong. We have men in these departments—such as the superintendents of sewers and streets—and we pay them \$3,600. Do you suppose they are going to sit quietly in their seats when they see men of no greater calibre than they are getting five thousand? It is an insult to bring in three green men here and put their salaries as high as the mayor receives. If I had been the chairman of that committee, I would have insisted in putting a report of \$3,500 a year. Last year gold was ten per cent higher than it is now, and if you give these commissioners four thousand, you give them ten per cent more than you gave the Board of Health last year. The superintendent of the Public Library sent in here last year and wanted a thousand dollars more. We voted him down; but have we lost him? No, sir. If he had got it very easily he would have come again and tried for more. We are not going to get men in these positions who have been successful in business. I believe the fire commission is a piece of extravagance, and that such a commission would prove just as valuable if we didn't pay them a cent. The commission in Albany don't receive a cent for their services. When we paid the assessors nothing, they served us best. That is the way to obtain competent men.

"I was in hopes that we should hear some argument from the gentleman in favor of five thousand. He has pointed out the duties of the fire commission, and it would seem that they are to discharge those of the Water Board by putting in Lowry hydrants and larger pipes. They will have arduous duties in that direction, for the work has been done already.

The gentleman says he favors high salaries all through. He must have forgotten his record last year. I think there was a handbill circulated saying he voted against the salary bill, but the people sent him back here. I am not going to vote the heads of departments five thousand a year and vote the laboring man only a dollar and a half a day. The laboring men are the bone and sinew of the country, and I don't know why the man who puts out fire with the hose should not be considered worth as much as a commissioner. Begin to raise the salaries down there. It is easy to advocate an increase of salaries; that is the atmosphere of this hall. A man is respected here who advocates high salaries. But he is not respected out of here so much. From the financial condition of the country at present, it is not best to increase salaries."

On Nov. 24 the following communication was received from the mayor, Henry L. Pierce:

Executive Department, City Hall, Boston, Nov. 24, 1873.

To the Honorable the City Council:

Gentlemen,—Having been elected to represent the third district of Massachusetts in the Congress which assembles at Washington on the first day of December next, it is my duty to resign the office of mayor of the city, and I hereby notify your honorable body of my resignation, which is to take effect on Saturday next, the twenty-ninth instant.

In making this announcement, I desire to acknowledge the very great obligations which I am under to the members of the government for their generous aid and support in the performance of my official duties during the present municipal year.

HENRY L. PIERCE.

On motion of Alderman Gibson, the resignation was accepted, and the communication was sent down.

RESIGNATION OF MAYOR PIERCE.

In one of the daily papers appeared the following:

The resignation of Mayor Pierce was communicated to the Board of Aldermen yesterday afternoon. The people of the Third Congressional District elected him to Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Hon. William Whiting, and to accept and perform the duties of that office, his presence at Washington on and after Monday next seems a duty which he owes to his constituents. The important questions which may possibly arise in Congress early during the session demand a full representation of our delegation. While we regret that he cannot complete his term of service as our chief magistrate, we know that no interest

will be endangered by his yielding his own wishes to the expressed opinions of his associates in the Massachusetts delegation. There is, perhaps, no legal objection to his holding both offices for a short time, but there is a rule of the House of Representatives which provides that "No member shall absent himself from the service of the House unless he have leave or be sick or unable to attend." There is no exigency in our municipal affairs which would seem to warrant Mayor Pierce in either asking or accepting a leave of absence as a special privilege. When we say that, had Mayor Pierce consented to forego congressional honors, Boston would have given him an almost unanimous re-election as mayor, it must be implied that his administration has been eminently creditable to him and most satisfactory to the people of Boston.

Mayor Pierce's resignation will take effect next Saturday. The next mayor will not be inaugurated until the first Monday in January. The provisions of the charter affecting this vacancy are as follows:

Sect. 29. In case of any vacancy in the office of mayor for any cause, he (chairman of Board of Aldermen) shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties of the office as long as such vacancy shall continue. But he shall continue to have a vote in the board, and shall not have the veto power.

Sect. 50. In case of the decease, inability, absence, or resignation of the mayor, and whenever there is a vacancy in the office from any cause, and the same being declared, and a vote passed by the Aldermen and Common Council respectively declaring such cause and the *expediency of electing a mayor* for the time being to supply the vacancy thus occasioned, the Board of Aldermen shall issue their warrants in due form for the election of a mayor, and the same proceedings shall be had as are hereinbefore provided for the choice of a mayor.

It will be seen that the expediency of electing a mayor to fill the vacancy is left with the two branches of the City Council, and if they do not think it expedient, the chairman of the Board of Aldermen, under Section 29, is empowered to perform all the duties of mayor, with the exception that he has not the veto power. In view of the fact that only thirty odd days will intervene before Mr. Cobb will take the position, it will not probably be thought expedient to order a special election. There is not, we think, any danger to be feared from such a precedent, though, should the two branches think differently, Mr. Cobb can be nominated, elected and installed to fill the vacancy at the regular election, which is to take place two weeks from to-day, and at the same time be elected for the year



OLD CHURCH IN JAFFREY, N. H.

1874. This, however, will not probably be done, and Alderman Cutter, chairman of the board, will be mayor for the balance of Mayor Pierce's unexpired term. Mr. Cutter has had a long experience in the board, and will perform the duties of mayor with ability and discretion.

MAYOR PIERCE'S TEMPORARY SUCCESSOR.

Another paper contained the following:

Mayor Pierce's resignation will take effect next Saturday. The next mayor will not be inaugurated until the first Monday in January. The expediency of electing a mayor to fill the vacancy is left with the two branches of the City Council, and if they do not think it expedient, the chairman of the Board of Aldermen, under Section 29, is empowered to perform all the duties of mayor, with the exception that he has not the veto power. In view of the fact that only thirty odd days will intervene before Mr. Cobb will take the position, it will not probably be thought expedient to order a special election. Should the two branches think differently, Mr. Cobb can be nominated, elected and installed to fill the vacancy at the regular election, which is to take place two weeks from to-day, and at the same time be elected for the year 1874. This, however, will not probably be done, and Alderman Cutter, chairman of the board, will be mayor for the balance of Mayor Pierce's unexpired term.

On Dec. 22 Alderman Sayward offered the following:

"Ordered, That the soup be furnished to the poor of the city of Boston by the Committee on Police, during the months of January and February, at an expense not exceeding \$3,000; the same to be charged to the appropriation for police."

Alderman Gibson called to the chair, Alderman Cutter said:

"I have no doubt the gentleman has done a great deal for charity, and is ready to do more; but I venture to say that if you take your position at any court where many poor families live, you won't see any visitor going in there. You will see children who are not clad well enough to go to his house and tell him about their wants. But those children will go down to the station houses and get a quart of soup, and I tell you it does lots of good. Charity given in that way is beneficial. These col-porteurs are well dressed, and they are very careful to whom they go and to whom they give their charities. I have lived near station houses and have seen how it works. It isn't well for this board to talk longer about soup, which costs only three and a half cents a quart.

"I think if you will turn to the records you will see that this order has

been passed for years, and the gentleman from Ward 1 has voted for it for three years. One year he put the order in. In the absence of law, custom is just as good. It has been the custom of this board to do it, and take it out of the appropriation for police. Now, if this is illegal, let the city solicitor, or anybody that sees fit, adjust its legality. I have voted for it, and I shall keep voting for it.

"I should like to know whether it isn't just as legal to furnish soup to the poor as it is to furnish it to the members of this board. The gentleman has fully approved of this."

The last meeting of the board took place Jan. 3, 1874, and the following resolutions were passed:

CITY OF BOSTON.

In Board of Aldermen, Jan. 3, 1874.

After the business of the board had been accomplished (Alderman Gibson in the chair), the following resolve was submitted by Alderman Quincy:

"Resolved, That the thanks of the Board of Aldermen be tendered to the Chairman, Hon. Leonard R. Cutter, for the ability, courtesy, impartiality and industry with which he has discharged the duties and performed the labors of his office during the past year, and for the satisfactory and commendable manner in which he has served as the acting Mayor since the resignation of His Honor Mayor Pierce."

Alderman Quincy, in support of the resolution, said:

"I deem myself fortunate, sir, that the privilege of offering this resolve testifying to our appreciation of the services of our Chairman falls to my lot, for the reason that while that gentleman and myself have so widely differed in our views of certain measures which have come under discussion, no one can more highly appreciate than I the conscientious zeal, industry and unshaken firmness with which he has supported his own convictions, and labored in the interest of the city during the past year. In behalf of those of us whose connection with the City Government is now to terminate, I doubt not that I utter the voice of all in assuring the Board of the sincere personal friendship and esteem with which we take leave of those who have been our fellow-laborers in this vineyard during the important municipal year which has just closed. Some of us would have willingly continued to contribute our services to the city which we love; others, to whom her interests are no less dear, would have found it impossible. But whatever may have been the varying

opinions and utterances of approval or criticism elicited among our fellow-citizens by our official course, I hope that all will agree that we may at least reply to those to whom we owe the honor of having held these seats, in the simple words with which one of the bravest of American soldiers closed his earthly career,—‘We have endeavored to do our duty.’”

Alderman Gaffield.—In seconding these resolutions, may I be permitted to say that in an experience of five years in our City Government I can look back upon no one with more pleasant memories than that which is just drawing to its close. A year ago our city was sorely afflicted by the visitation of fire and pestilence. The people, rising in their majesty and power above all local and party ties, selected and elected the members of the present Board. The Board, in the same liberal spirit, made choice of its Chairman. In the same spirit the Chairman has presided, and the members have spoken and acted towards each other. We have had important questions before us throughout the year, and they have been earnestly, fully and heartily discussed. Each member has had his own opinion, and has defended it in a manly and independent way. Each has seemed to vie with his neighbor in honest endeavors to serve the public good. In all our debates there has been a marked courtesy and respect for the opinions of others, and no time has been wasted in disputes upon parliamentary tactics. The year will stand out as a red-letter year in the memory of every member of the Board, and equally so in the annals of the city, for the many important measures inaugurated and consummated for that city's welfare.

It would be unbecoming for us to speak of our own acts. If they have been wise and judicious, right and honest, they will in all coming time speak for themselves in the promotion of the best welfare of the community. The consciousness of having done modestly, honestly, and to the best of our ability, our humble part in the government of the city during a most important and trying year in its history, is the richest reward of any public servant, rising far above the petty triumphs of political victors, and making one oblivious of the petty annoyances of harsh criticism and unjust judgment. Such a consciousness can our Chairman enjoy, with the added satisfaction of the hearty approval of all his associates at this Board. I feel assured that I only voice our unanimous sentiment in saying, at this closing hour, that among the choicest memories of our lives will be the recollection of this very busy, but pleasant year, spent in public service, and especially grateful will be the remem-

brance of the uniform courtesy of our Chairman towards the members of the Board, and of their friendly relations with each other.

Alderman Clark.—It gives me great pleasure to add my testimony to the faithful and impartial manner in which the Chairman has executed the duties of his office during the past year. His close attention to his duties, both as Chairman and as member of this Board, is well worthy the imitation of those who will come after him, and if all who are called to the administration of the affairs of the Government do so with an eye single to the city's welfare, as he has done, it will be well for the interest of the city. I believe that every member of the present City Government thinks that, as Chairman and member of this Board, our Chairman has exerted his influence solely in the manner which he believed to be for the best interests of the City of Boston. And, Mr. Chairman, I can say that the city is particularly fortunate in that it is not to lose his services during the year 1874. It is fortunate for the city and fortunate for the members of the Board.

Alderman Power.—I cannot permit our proceedings to close without indorsing the sentiments which have been expressed by the gentlemen who have spoken in relation to the Chairman; and, Mr. Chairman, I would say a word or two in relation to our associates whose terms of office have ended. I regret exceedingly that the ties of friendship and good feeling existing between us all are to be severed, and I regret the retirement of these gentlemen from the Board, on the city's account. They have been good and faithful servants, and the city will be fortunate, indeed, if those who are about to fill their places perform their duties with the same fidelity that I believe these gentlemen have. And I regret exceedingly that the people who have the power to form this Board could not have had the same opportunity of an intimate acquaintance with those gentlemen that we have had; for if they could have known and seen them as we who have been associated with them, they certainly would have been with us again another year. I wish, Mr. Chairman, before they depart, to thank them all for the exceedingly kind treatment that I have received at the hands of all of them, and to wish them many years of prosperity and happiness.

Alderman Sayward.—I didn't propose to say a single word on this occasion, but as my friend has alluded to the retiring members, it would seem proper that some one should respond, and I, being his next neighbor, and having fought him as hard as any one, take the opportunity to do it. I can say that all my associations with the members of the City

Government have, in most cases, been very pleasant, though it isn't to be expected that in four years' experience there should be no clashing. In reference to the resolutions of respect for our Chairman, I heartily concur with the sentiments expressed in them. Though differing with him on many questions, and though sometimes overstepping the bounds of courtesy—although my friend on my right says our debates have been courteous—if I have ever offended any one here, publicly or privately, I am willing to be forgiven. There is one quality in our Chairman which I have particularly admired; when he makes up his mind that he is right, he sticks to it, and that is what I like in any man, even if he differs from me in opinion.

Alderman Hulbert.—I don't know that there ever was a Chairman of a deliberative body who didn't discharge his duties faithfully and with impartiality. I don't believe history furnishes a single instance where it hasn't been done. I can't second this resolution before this body, however, unless permitted to relieve myself of some mental reservations that I have. I suppose my location in the hall has been an unfavorable one, but I have felt during the year that the eye of the Chairman has been upon me most of the time. I have felt as if it had been directed toward me personally. We all know that he has a big eye and a peculiar eye, and as questions of pecuniary importance to the city have come up here, I have felt the standing influence of that eye, and if I have been led into the paths of economy in making expenditures, it has been due as much to the influence of that eye as anything else. At any rate, I go out of the Board without a single monument to which my friends can point and say, "He did it." Sometimes it is much to one's credit to bring forward an enterprise, and ever afterward his name is linked with it as the mover of it. If, for that reason, I shall go down into history as a man without a reputation, I question whether it cannot, in part at least, be laid to the eye of our Chairman, whom you regard so impartial. That eye has been upon me, and with all sincerity I can say that it has influenced me very much this year. I feel that I owe largely any influence I may have had to the cautious judgment and consideration of the Chairman of this Board, in connection with committees of which he and I have been members. His constant courtesy to me has won my uniform esteem and regard, and I wish to say here that I feel that the citizens of Boston are to be congratulated that the services of our retiring Chairman are to be retained in this Board during the ensuing year. If there is a man who, from day to day, studies the interests of the city, it is our Chairman, and no member

of this Board has the interest of the city more constantly on his mind than he has. His influence is felt in the right direction. We have it here upon minor matters, and from the beginning to the end of the year his influence has been in the right direction in regard to the city's expenditures. In the year to come it will be a source of satisfaction to me to know that Alderman Cutter is present in this Board and taking part in the discussions to come up. I am not without solicitude in regard to the future of this city. All my utterances have been prompted by a fear for the future interests of the city. I can never feel hereafter as I have in the years that are past. The interests of the city of Boston will feel more dear to me than I ever felt them before, and I wonder now how I could have lived so long here and never felt any more interest in the City Government than I have. It is a wonder to me that citizens of wealth can live so regardless of the interest of the city as they do. I wish, also, to say one thing more; there is a wrong impression among the people of Boston in regard to City Hall. There is an impression that things are all going in the wrong direction here, and that everything is controlled by some ring or other. I take pleasure in saying, to-day, that since I have been here I have seen no ring, nor the shadow of a ring. I feel glad to be able to say that the members of this Board are as free as any men can be from anything of that kind, and that the impressions which many persons in the community have with reference to things here are erroneous. While I believe in the dangers which exist, I can testify that I have seen nothing like rings since I have been here.

In closing, I wish to bear testimony to the courtesy of the members of this Board. I came here without any experience in deliberative bodies, and it has been partly on account of their courtesy that I have been enabled to go along through the year without any very great degree of discomfort. It is a matter of very great regret that I must part with gentlemen for whom I have such strong regard—every one of whom going into the next City Government has my entire confidence. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, having relieved myself of all mental reservations, I am willing to second the resolution.

Alderman Emery.—I believe I can freely and conscientiously indorse all that these gentlemen have said with regard to our Chairman as to the manner he has presided over our deliberations during the past year. It is with feelings of sadness that I realize that the sessions of this present Board are so soon to terminate. The pleasant associations and acquaintances here formed have been to me a source of much pleasure, and will

long linger in my memory. Could our present associates have continued in service with us who remain for 1874, my labors, it seems to me, would in anticipation be much lightened. Having commenced my labors here only last January, I have had great help and support from the experience of many of my friends here older in service than myself, and whose support and counsel we so soon shall lose. The superintendents of the departments whom we come in contact with are left, and I think their services are invaluable. Indeed, we could not get along without their valuable aid. The services of these gentlemen, and our City Clerk, and Clerk of Committees are all known to be the main wheels and indispensable machinery to the business of the City of Boston.

The resolution was adopted unanimously, by a rising vote.

THE CHAIRMAN'S RESPONSE.

Alderman Cutter resumed the chair and said:

"*Gentlemen of the Board of Aldermen:* The long and fatiguing labors of the year are now brought to a close. Before formally adjourning this Board, I embrace the opportunity to say that I have endeavored, to the utmost of my ability, to discharge faithfully, honestly and impartially the duties which you were pleased to devolve upon me in elevating me to this honorable position. If, on any occasion, I have wounded, for a moment, any one's feelings, it is the cause of true and heartfelt regret. I beg you, gentlemen, to accept my sincere thanks for the unanimous vote that has just been passed approving of my conduct. I shall endeavor on all occasions, in whatever situation I may be placed, to act in such a manner as to have the approbation of my own conscience, and in so doing, I trust of meeting the approbation of generous, just and honorable citizens.

"Gentlemen, I thank you for the kindness and courtesy which you have invariably extended to me. I bid you an official farewell, and may the friendships here formed continue during our lives."

Alderman Gaffield offered the following:

"Ordered, That the final proceedings of the Board, together with the address of the Chairman, be printed for the use of the members of the government." Passed.

On motion of Alderman Gaffield, the board adjourned *sine die*.

In the fall of 1873 my father was elected, for the fourth time, as an alderman. The following comment appeared in the paper at the time:

LEONARD R. CUTTER—WARD 6.

Mr. Cutter, who has so faithfully performed the duties of an alderman for the past three years, is again put forward by our citizens for a re-election for another year. Mr. Cutter is now acting Mayor of the city, and it was his intention to retire to private life at the first of the-year, but his services being so well known, the prominent merchants have again put him forward. As chairman of the Board during the past year he has filled a most responsible position, to the entire satisfaction of the whole Board and the public generally. Certainly in this case the office has sought the man. We are glad that he has consented to again become a member of the Board. His large business interest in the city makes him conversant with all the wants of the public. He is a man of most sterling integrity and is independent upon all matters. No clique can favor or force him. He looks to what is right and does what is right, regardless of all consequences. He is certain to be elected, and it is almost useless for us to enumerate his many qualifications for the position, except that he may be elected by a rousing majority.

His associates this year were: mayor, Samuel C. Cobb; Aldermen, John T. Clark, chairman, James Power, Alanson Bigelow, Solomon B. Stebbins, Francis Peters, Charles J. Prescott, A. J. Hall, Roland Worthington, Hiram Emery, Thomas B. Harris, William Francis Brooks.

He served on the following committees: Assessors' Department, Aldermen Harris, Cutter and Stebbins; Claims Department, Aldermen Cutter, Worthington and Brooks; Engineer's Department, Aldermen Bigelow and Cutter; Institutions Department, Aldermen Worthington, Cutter and Prescott; Public Instruction Department, Aldermen Prescott, Cutter and Worthington; Bridges Department, Aldermen Cutter, Power and Harris; Paving Department, Aldermen Cutter, Power and Peters; Police Department, Aldermen Cutter, Clark and Peters.

On Feb. 9 the question of the water supply was considered by an order to print five hundred extra copies of the report of the Cochituate Water Board on an additional supply of water.

Alderman Cutter remarked as follows:

"While I am willing to accommodate the chairman of the Committee on Printing, if his appropriation is getting short, I do not feel willing to let so important a measure as this go by, inasmuch as it is for the benefit of the other branch. I am a member of the Water Board, and I know the importance of pressing forward this matter of building a new con-



LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE TWENTY-FIVE

duit. I understand that this matter is hanging in the other branch for want of information. The members of that body have the right to be fully informed upon the subject, and I am satisfied that if they are informed they will vote for the appropriation. If the printing of this report will be the means of giving them the necessary information, I hope the order will pass.

"I supposed that it was the duty of the superintendent of printing to superintend what he ordered to be printed, and I did not know that it was necessary for him to say what should or should not be printed. For my part, I have all the information I want; but I want those gentlemen in the Common Council to be enlightened. Our water supply may be exhausted at any moment, when we do not dream of it. Our conduit is pressed very hard every day, and is liable to give out. I do not see any good reason for delay."

Feb. 16 the park question was discussed. In the discussion Alderman Cutter said:

"The alderman from the Highlands well says this is a movement of great magnitude. It is one of the most expensive projects that has ever come into this government. I am surprised to see that in a little over a year since the great fire of the ninth of November, and less than a year since the fire of May, by which this city lost over a hundred millions of property, before we have got over that loss they have come here and tried to make us believe that it is our duty to cast our votes in favor of a public park. It cannot be that the taxpayers, the people, have asked for this; for when you see the press take hold of a thing you may be certain that a majority of the people are not in favor of it, but the press desire to make the people take hold of it. They know it is a weak subject, and they herald it before the people so as to get public sentiment wrought up on the subject, that some one can sell a piece of land for a park, and that somebody can take in partners with him who will be able to bring up public sentiment, that this body may dare to vote for public parks. Now, sir, if you will look at our avenues you will see that you cannot trot a horse on the pavements without danger. Look at Washington Street, with paving that you cannot trot a light carriage over. That paving should be removed and block granite substituted. Look at Columbus Avenue, which ends nowhere. It should run into the country. All our avenues should lead out into the country and be well paved, so that we can take our private horses and carriages and drive over any of them into the country. Look at the streets of Charlestown,

look at the North End; the pavements there should all be removed before this board should think of talking about a public park. We shall come in this year and ask for thirteen hundred thousand dollars; we ought to have two millions, but I do not wish to tax the people too heavily. This park means an addition to the debt of twenty million dollars. Well has the gentleman said that this is a case of magnitude. I tell you it is so, and the taxpayers of Boston have not yet got over last year's loss so that they should even think or speak of parks at present. I beg of this board to stop and think before it votes to roll up the city debt twenty millions more. The gentleman says this does not commit us. In my experience in this government, when we start out we always get committed before we get through. I judge of the future by the past, and I do not wish to commit the city to this scheme. I would rather sell the land that we have, the Farm School, the Beacon-Hill Reservoir, which bring no income, and which it is our duty to sell in order to lessen the debt of the city, than go on and advocate a park to increase the debt of the city.

"I think it is very well understood why it is desired to have the commission appointed by the mayor. He is in favor of a park, and of course would appoint three men in favor of a park. I would state, also, that, although there is no petition before this board for a park, there is a remonstrance signed by many heavy taxpayers. I suppose gentlemen understand that a park is an expensive luxury which can be indulged in only about four months in the year."

Feb. 20 the board took up the order passed by the Common Council requesting His Honor the mayor to petition the Legislature for the passage of an act authorizing the board to require plumbers to be licensed and to regulate the construction of water fixtures in dwellings and manufacturing. The following were Alderman Cutter's views on the subject:

"He said the order looked too much like a job, and gave the Boston board too much power. It interfered, in a measure, with private rights, and would prevent citizens from hiring such mechanics as they pleased.

"He said it would have no better effect than licensing saloon-keepers would have. The licensing of the latter did not improve the quality of the food in the least degree.

"He opposed the order, and said a hardship would be inflicted if it passed. The owners of tenements and buildings would charge the expense of changing the fixtures to the people who occupied the buildings, and it seemed to him that a hardship would be placed upon poor people which they should not be compelled to endure. He believed

in dealing liberally with citizens, and particularly with poor people. The order under consideration was sprung upon the council, and had its nature been fully understood, he doubted that it would have passed in the other branch. He hoped the good sense of the aldermen would lead them to vote against this order.

"He said the nominations were made to this board, and therefore this board is responsible for an inefficiency of the Water Board and for electing incompetent men to places on that board, although he did not know that he was ready to say that the board is incompetent, or that it is any less competent than the board to which the gentleman from Ward 8 belongs—the directors of ferries. He understood that boats had been damaged several hundreds of dollars, and no one had been held responsible for it. But let that pass. There is no perfect board existing. The Water Board was established for some purpose or other. The same reason exists to-day as when it was established. You can abolish it if you choose. The members of that board do a great deal of business, which occupies considerable time, and hear a great many complaints from citizens. From his own experience as an owner of real estate in this city, he was confirmed in the opinion that an order of this kind ought not to pass. When he was elected on the Water Board, he thought it would not do to let water run to waste in his house, and he gave notice to his tenants that they must not do so. The consequence was that it was all frozen up. The pipes would burst, and sometimes they would run all day and night, Sundays, and nobody would know it. In his judgment more water was wasted by the bursting of pipes than in trying to save water. He knew that the water-closet Mr. Davis speaks of is going to cost something like twenty-five or thirty dollars in excess of the present style. They have got to be put in at the expense of somebody, and you know that such expenses are mostly imposed on real estate. The owners of personal property shirk it. Therefore it becomes this government not to impose such a tax upon real estate. If this order had been so judicious, why did not they bring it here in proper season, so that it might have proper consideration, and not bring it in at the last minute, jump it through the other branch and then through this board? This is no new subject, and need not be rushed through the Legislature this year; the members of the board are hardly ready to vote for it, and he hoped they would refer it."

March 2 the subject of the water supply was continued, and it was ordered:

"That the Committee on Water be requested to report upon the expediency of adding to the water supply of the city of Boston by bringing the waters of Flax Pond and Sluice Pond, Cedar Lake, in as direct a line to East Boston as the nature of the intervening space will permit—the connection with the East Boston works to be made on the Chelsea side of Chelsea Creek."

Alderman Cutter's views were thus expressed:

"The city engineer has already made a report upon the quality of the water of Flax Pond, and I object to making such an expense when it is entirely unnecessary. If the alderman who offered the order had read that report, he would have seen that the water was not such as the people of East Boston would want.

"It looks to me very much like a put-up job. There has been considerable buzzing around, trying to sell Flax Pond to the city, but the Water Board did not think it judicious to buy it. I presume the owner would like to sell it, and if he could get an order through here for the city to buy it, he would be pleased. If the gentleman had read the reports, I do not think he would want to supply the community he resides in with that kind of water."

March 9 the salary bill was under discussion. Alderman Cutter said:

"The committee reported that the salaries of the street commissioners shall be \$3,500, and all the members signed the report. When they come in here, one member advocates \$4,000, virtually slaughtering his own report. I would like to see a unanimous report from that committee.

"I trust the board will allow it to be recommitted. I can see that there is considerable dissatisfaction among the heads of different departments. They were told by the Committee on Salaries that there would be no changes made, and therefore they did not present their claims to have their salaries increased. Now they find that changes have been made, and as they do not wish to be slighted, or appear as stars of second magnitude, they consider that it is but just to them that they should have a voice before the Committee on Salaries, and I trust this board will allow them to do so.

"I do not know how the gentleman can understand that, for the record shows that I voted against any increase. The fault is with the Salary Committee; they made a mistake by favoring some and not favoring others. I do not know why we should increase salaries this year. Certainly business outside of City Hall does not demand it. The street commissioners will work just as well if we do not increase their salaries. We

will only burden the taxpayers so much more. We have the same agents to run the government that we had last year. Now is it right to impose this additional burden upon the taxpayers? No argument can be raised in favor of an increase of salaries in City Hall this year. I venture to say that if the officers leave their positions, there will be as many applicants for them as we have for places on the police force. If you desire to go on and increase the taxes of this city—and no greater curse can be put upon the city than a high rate of taxation—you will find that capitalists will leave us. I beg the board to consider the interests of the taxpayers before imposing this extra expense upon them.

“The gentleman does not meet the question fairly or honestly. He was chairman of the Committee on Salaries. Many heads of departments spoke to me and said the chairman of the Committee on Salaries said that no change was to be made in salaries this year. I say they were wrongfully informed. I say, make an increase for those who are entitled to it. Here are our auditor and treasurer. Why are they not entitled to an increase? Are they not all valuable men? To slight them in this way is to lose them. If they can get a larger salary in State Street because of their long-tried honesty in this government, we may lose them. I say, deal honestly and fairly with them, and not talk about the imperfections of the police force. No man is perfect. Who is the man that can throw the first stone? The gentleman may claim perfection, but I do not see it in this transaction. The committee came in here and did not stand by their report, and it was the first case of the kind I ever saw from the Committee on Salaries. They did not treat the subject intelligently; if they had they would have stood by the report. I say this is the way to lose faithful officers.

“It does not seem to me that a board like this—and especially the other branch—should undertake to raise the salaries of the heads of departments without first having had a report from the committee. One member of the Common Council got up and moved to raise the salary of the clerk of police, when I, as chairman of the Police Committee, never knew he wanted more pay. There are plenty of men who want the position at the present salary; I think there are too many clerks in there now. Each man in the council seems to have a favorite; he jumps up, moves to raise the salary, and it goes through. I think the Committee on Salaries ought to give us a report that they can stand by.

“Let us see what these commissions do. The fire commissioners have recommended a decrease in the salaries of the chief engineer and super-

intendent of fire alarms. If they are going to follow the commissions, why not decrease the salaries of the commissioners?"

On March 12 a special meeting of the board was called by the mayor to receive the official announcement of the death of Charles Sumner. Remarks were made by several of the aldermen. Alderman Cutter said:

"Mr. Mayor: Again has an impressive warning come to teach us that in the midst of life we are in death. The lessons of His providence, severe as they may be, often become merciful dispensations, like that which is now spreading sorrow through the land, and which is reminding us that we have higher duties to fulfil and greater responsibilities to encounter than those that meet us here. Another great man has fallen in our land, ripe in years and in honors, but never dearer to the American people than when called from the theatre of his services and renown to that final bar where the lofty and the lowly must all meet at last.

"It is almost a quarter of a century since he took his seat in the Senate of our country. Since then he has belonged to his country, and has taken a part, and a prominent part, both in peace and war, in all great questions affecting her interest and her honor, and though it has been my fortune often to differ from him, yet I believe he was as honest a man as ever participated in the councils of a nation. Anxious to relieve the afflicted and the down-trodden, during all the vicissitudes of a long and eventful life, calumny and detraction emptied their vials upon him. But how glorious the change!

"He outlived malice and envy. Frank and fearless in the expression of his opinions and in the performance of his duties, with rare powers of eloquence, which never failed to rivet the attention of his auditory, and which always commanded admiration even when they did not carry conviction, prompt in decision and firm in action, and with a vigorous intellect trained in the contests of a stirring life, and strengthened by enlarged experience and observation and great purity of purpose,—these were the elements of his power and success, and we dwell upon them with mournful gratification now when we shall soon follow him to the cold and silent tomb where we shall leave him alone to the mercies of his God and ours."

The mayor appointed Aldermen Stebbins, Cutter and Prescott as members of the committee.

On April 20, 1874, an order for the construction of an elevator in the City Hall, at a cost not exceeding \$12,000, was discussed. Alderman Cutter opposed it in the following:

"I am opposed to the passage of that order. I have the same opinion

now that I have had for the last two or three years. We do not need an elevator in this hall. Members of the government have found no trouble in reaching their destination so far, and certainly the elevator will occupy space which will decrease the beauty of the building. I trust we shall not cut this building up in that way by placing an elevator in it. Any one passing through the corridors and up the stairway of this building will at once see that if an elevator is put in it will at once mar the beauty of the structure. I do not see the necessity of the elevator. I doubt very much if business men ride up and down in this elevator; it will be only used by those who are loafing about the hall. Those who have business to do will not wait for an elevator.

"How many elevators do they calculate to put in with \$12,000?

"It seems to me that is a very large sum for an elevator, and that half of this sum would be sufficient. It shows conclusively that when an appropriation is made the committees are anxious to spend the money. When the appropriation was before this government, the gentleman opposite said we are not obliged to spend the money. I say it will be money improperly spent. When the tax bill was before us, one gentleman said the citizens coming here ask to be accommodated, and to be carried to the upper part of the building easily. Now, I ask if a person coming here on business would stop and wait for an elevator. It will not accommodate the citizens. It will accommodate the School Board, but perhaps they may not be in this building a long time. We are contemplating a new Court House building, and in that case we would have the old Court House, and would have no use for the elevator. It is an expensive luxury that should not be tolerated.

"Are there any vacant rooms in the upper part of this building at the present time?

"The gentleman seems to compare the City Hall with a hotel. The difference is that we have our rooms full all the time and plenty of patronage; but the hotels do not, and they put in elevators to get patrons. I guess the Common Council will object to having their anteroom taken away; we tried to do it once before, but it was impossible. A body composed of seventy men with no salary ought to have some room."

On April 27, in considering an order to allow the sum of \$200 to each post of the G. A. R. to aid them in the observation of Decoration Day in the following May, Alderman Cutter said:

"In 1871, when General Cowdin had the honor of a seat in this board, he put in an order for this purpose, but it was for \$100 for each post. No

one would accuse General Cowdin of not being generous in regard to these posts. At that time the number of posts was much less than it is now; I understand that at present there are eleven. While I desire to do my duty in regard to the posts, I also regard it as my duty to look to the interests of the citizens and taxpayers of Boston. As they have anticipated some sum this year, I will not move to indefinitely postpone the order, although I think the custom has been continued as long as it was first intended; but I do move to amend the order by substituting \$100 for \$200.

"I do not propose to go into the merits of the question, because every member of this board knows why it was done, and what it was done for. I have been told by members of posts that the money is not spent in as judicious and proper a way as was intended when we first voted for the appropriation. I suppose we are placed here to legislate for the interest of the living as well as the dead; and as to patriotism, I prefer that patriotism which covers the whole country and does not foster sectional jealousy. I have yet to learn that money was ever appropriated to strew flowers upon the graves of any of our Revolutionary ancestors. I can appreciate the feelings of those who lost husbands, fathers or children in the war, and who visit and lay flowers upon the graves of their loved ones; but when we, as a city government, appropriate money for the promiscuous strewing of flowers upon graves, I do not think the ceremony cultivates the fine feeling that it does when performed by orphans and widows in their own loving way. If this custom is to be maintained, it should be done by those who have their feelings and hearts in it; the money should be raised by subscription, and towns and cities should not be taxed in this way. As to the legality of spending money in this way, I cannot say that it is proper to do so. I hope the day will soon come when this sectional jealousy shall cease. We all know the persecution which was visited upon the late Charles Sumner for his efforts to remove all signs of sectional strife from the battle flags, and it certainly becomes us to pattern after him. If we are true patriots, I can see no other course than for us to do that which will be beneficial to the whole country."

"May 11.—Ordered, That the superintendent of streets be directed to pave Kilby Street from Milk Street to State Street with burnettized spruce blocks at an estimated expense of six thousand dollars."

Alderman Cutter's views on the subject were as follows:

"I have had the honor to be upon the Paving Committee last year and this year, and I have been adverse to spending the city's money for wood



PLACE OF BUSINESS, COR. GROVE AND PHILLIPS STREETS.
1850 — 1858.

pavements. I do not believe it is a judicious use of money, and when the gentleman undertakes to tell me that the wood will last nearly as long as stone, I think his argument is hardly worth noticing, because there is scarcely a member of this board who will believe it. That burnettizing process costs ten cents a square yard and does not amount to the snap of a finger. We do not know whether it rots wood or saves it. You go on Columbus Avenue and take up the pavements, and you will find the wood a mess of slivers, even where it has been down only a short time. You can look at Court Street and judge for yourselves whether it should be paved with wood or block granite. The gentleman seems to have a kindness for petitioners; the majority of the committee is going for the good of the whole. If you ask the truckmen, as we did last summer, they will say, put down either all wood or all stone, because a horse is apt to slip in passing from one to the other. I asked Mr. Harris, and he would not advise that Kilby Street should be paved with wood, and I have the utmost confidence in his ability and judgment. Kilby Street runs into Liberty Square, and you cannot lay wood and block granite together advantageously; if you pave Kilby Street with wood, it involves the expense of paving all the streets leading into it in the same way. When a delegation were on here from Cincinnati, and were asked why they used wood, they said if they could get block granite as cheap as we could, they would not use wood. New York City has abandoned using wood. I do not know of any New England city but has abandoned wood. It is foolishly spending money. The gentleman has come in here with quite a lengthy report; it reads very much like the document issued by an owner of a wood-pavement patent. I do not know where he got those ideas, but I do know that it is unnecessary to go to London for them. We can show the pavement here. He copied the statistics, but he does not know that they are true. We desire to do the greatest good to the greatest number. A wood pavement has to be repaired within five years; it is also leaky; some blocks outlast others, and you cannot repair it as you can block granite. I trust the board will pause before they waste the city's money by placing wood pavements upon our streets."

On June 2 the question of appropriating \$29,000, which was left from \$200,000 appropriated for a smallpox hospital, came up for discussion. Alderman Cutter very decidedly expressed his views:

"It seems, then, that out of \$200,000 appropriated for a smallpox hospital there are only \$29,000 left for them to get away with. That seems to be the condition we are now in, and it is a question with me whether it

is advisable to allow the Committee on Health to look up another site and, perhaps, leave it as we did before. They spent all that money and have no place fit to use. It looks to me as if the order ought not to pass.

"It is true that a burnt child dreads the fire, and that is the reason why I raise an objection to the Committee on Health having the remainder of that appropriation of \$29,000 to spend—perhaps in the same way that the \$70,000 might have been used. We should judge of the future by the past. I do not propose to endorse any trifling with the city's money in such a way. There is not a case of smallpox in the city to-day, and no urgent necessity for the appropriation of this money. There is a prospect that the improvement of the Swett Street district will be completed before any cases of smallpox will reach this city, and there we have as good a hospital as we want. It was thought to be so, but a prejudice grew up against the government and the mayor because the disease increased. But we checked it by ordering the free vaccination of the whole city. We had a smallpox hospital near the City Hospital for years, but it was removed. We have built a boat on purpose to convey the patients to Gallup's Island, and why this order should be put in to spend the remainder of that appropriation I cannot tell; and when the place is selected, the Board of Health can say it is improper, and they will hold on to the Marcella Street Hospital. If the committee select a place at that price, it will be some swampy place, and the Board of Health will object.

"The alderman from Ward 12 seems to infer that somebody has been reflected upon. I say this money has been foolishly spent, and that is why I oppose this order. The gentleman says that the Board of Health must approve the site; they may say you must buy this man's farm, and you must do it and pay their price. I say there is no need of a smallpox hospital, and believe we could have got along with the Swett Street Hospital, notwithstanding the Board of Health. Some physicians thought that site a good one; others did not. I do not propose to cultivate a stubborn plant by making this appropriation of \$29,000.

"The alderman seems to rely greatly upon the Board of Health, when it was stated that a place was located last year which proved to be a put-up job, and this celebrated Board of Health endorsed it.

"Both the chairmen of the Committee on Health, this year and last, are something alike in opinion. Last year a lot was selected, and it turned out that the chairman of the Committee on Health had an interest in it. It may be that the chairman this year is in the same predicament. I am only predicting the future by the past."

On June 8 an order for the appointment by the mayor of three able non-resident civil engineers to make a full and comprehensive examination of the possible water supply for this city was presented. In the discussion Alderman Cutter said:

"I shall oppose this order because it means the spending of money. I think the alderman from the Highland District can obtain more intelligence than he possesses without our spending several thousand dollars to give it to him, if he is open to conviction. If he is not open to conviction, ten thousand dollars paid to foreign engineers will not benefit him. The trouble is, we have rain nearly every day. We ride out to see Stony Brook flowing over, and one member says there is sufficient to supply the city. But suppose you had gone to Lake Cochituate and had seen that when it was so low that it had no supply from its tributaries, and we were pumping there every day until we got relief from Sudbury River and Farm Pond. When I turned my back upon that lake then, I said I would vote for a sufficient supply of water, if it took ten millions of dollars. I never would trust a city so large as this to so small a creek. The trouble is, we have so many rains. Let there come a drought and you will see the matter in its true light. The members of the Council differ in opinion. One thinks Flax Pond will give a supply, another Shawsheen, etc., and it is all very well if we can always have rain. But we must judge of the future by the past and prepare for the future by building a safe conduit of sufficient size, in an ample watershed to give us an abundant supply. Then we would be safe. What is this city worth without a sufficient supply of water? I find those men who have opposed this water supply are in favor of a park. They favor economy in water, but go for extravagance on a park. You have only got to question them to find out their designs. It does not become this government to oppose having a good supply of water. We do not want to advertise that a man must not use his hose, or that he must let the dirt accumulate on his window frames because we cannot let him use the water to wash it off. It is a narrow, contracted view that will try to shut down upon this water question. We have been putting this subject off time after time, and orders have come in here referring the subject to different engineers, and questioning the integrity of our own servants, men whom we have elected. Does it become the members of this board to do so? I say not. We should trust in their integrity until we have cause to doubt them. I say it is nonsense to pass this order. We have got all the intelligence on the subject we can, and there is no doubt the order to seize the water of Sudbury River

would have passed both branches but for the abundant rains we have had."

Another order to appoint three physicians to examine and report on the sanitary qualities of Sudbury, Mystic, Shawsheen and Charles River waters raised opposition from Alderman Cutter as follows:

"If we desire to find out the quality of the water, we should employ chemists; that has been done already, and the results may be seen at the office of the Water Board. I do not see the necessity of spending money unless we are able to get an equivalent for it."

The subject of the collection of taxes being presented, Alderman Cutter said:

"I had the honor of being a member of the Committee on Finance last year, and we adopted that method of collecting the taxes, so that they should be due on the first of October, and six per cent interest should be charged till the first of January, and on and after that date twelve per cent should be charged. I think it is a good and practical order for this government to adopt, because the city borrows money. We passed an order at the last meeting to borrow four millions temporarily, to be paid when the taxes come in. If we cannot depend upon these taxes being paid in, we shall have to raise money in some other way. It does seem to me that we should compel citizens to pay their taxes in some way or other. So far as I am individually concerned, I would prefer to have a less per cent, so that, if I choose, I could use the money to better advantage. I think we should adhere to our action at the last meeting. The city has had to borrow money at eighteen per cent in order to run the government, and if there should come a panic we do not want to borrow money at that rate. In order to keep our credit good, I think we should adhere to our former vote.

"I do not think it helps the poor man at all. From my experience, it is those who pay the smallest taxes that are the most prompt. If you ask the treasurer, he will tell you that the largest sums come in on the last day. I have heard large capitalists say that they can make money by keeping back their taxes, and if we adopt this amendment we shall benefit the largest taxpayers. It becomes the city to pay its servants promptly, and it is businesslike to collect the taxes promptly. The banks do not give but three days of grace; if we were to let the taxes run three months longer, it will be the same old story. It becomes this government to keep up its credit and pay its bills promptly, and it will insure economy to have its taxes paid early.

"I do not see any force in the gentleman's argument. People have had to pay taxes every year, and know exactly when they are due, and have plenty of time to prepare for them. The difficulty is, the alderman has plenty of time, and he can speculate with his money. If we charge him twelve per cent, he thinks that it will not be profitable to keep his taxes and invest the money in old iron. We cannot make promises to pay on the strength of the taxes unless the people pay them. There must be some time for people to pay their taxes, else they will never pay them. I do not believe it is profitable or judicious legislation not to make it for the interest of capitalists to pay their taxes within three months."

June 15 a motion to reconsider the order to appoint the three physicians was made, and after a short discussion the order was passed. During the discussion Alderman Cutter said:

"I have no objection to passing orders if the chairman of the committee thinks they are important, but it does seem to me that we have spent money enough on this subject. We have already spent almost as much money as it would cost to procure an extra supply.

"This government voted \$500,000 for an additional water supply, and authorized the Water Board to spend it. Are we going to spend money to suit the notions of individuals? We have an engineer elected by the City Council, and yet his statements are sought to be passed by. I say it does not become us to do so. We spent \$10,000 to obtain facts, and yet there seems to be a prejudice against them. The trouble is, there has been plenty of rain. We could get a supply to-day from Stony Brook, but what is Stony Brook without continual rains? Where would we have been when Lake Cochituate was only eight inches above the conduit, if we had not tapped Sudbury River?

"It was only three years ago when the inhabitants of East Boston came over here with bottles full of sediment which they got from the Mystic. I am willing to purify the Mystic, but I am not willing to trust it for an ample supply. As for these doctors, you cannot get three to agree, and they will come back and want three more appointed."

On June 22 the appointment of a Boston Water Board was discussed. During the discussion Alderman Cutter said:

"I am opposed to commissions, to outside boards in this government. I believe neither the directors of public institutions, the directors of ferries, the Water Board, nor any such boards ought to exist. They are very expensive. But you cannot do the business of this city unless you

pay something for doing it. You cannot get a superintendent of streets to do that work without paying a high salary. You may call them commissioners or not, but you have got to pay them for their services. You cannot get first-class men outside of this government to take positions on the Water Board and discharge the duties as faithfully as they deserve. And why? Because the labor is so immense. It has so increased. Annexation has increased it, and here you propose to unite the Cochituate and Mystic water boards and make the labor double. Can you expect men to go there from day to day and do that labor without being paid? You may have your committee from this board, but you must have your agents, and you may call them a commission or anything else. I have tried to induce good men to accept positions on the Water Board, and they cannot afford to sacrifice the time. Now, if the gentlemen can show that this minority report is competent for us to adopt to carry out this branch of business, I am the man to vote for it. But unless I see something that will carry out this branch of the business, which is the most important in this city government, I shall not endorse that minority report. I want to see the business carried out in a proper manner, and I will call it a commission if you please, only let the work be done. The gentleman has produced an argument against commissions of three, and says that in the State of New York they have reduced one such board to one member. Now if we can get the right man, let us do so, and have a committee from this board on that department. But do not let matters go on in the loose way that you have. The two boards do not know whether they are going to remain in office twenty-four hours or not. The clerks are resigning. Go on as you think best; but this work has got to be done in a proper way. The gentleman may slur at me because I went against the fire commission last year. I did so because I was chairman of the Fire Department Committee, and we had confidence in ourselves. But there were men interested in insurance companies who had been sitting still and recommending others to invest in their stocks. They were the ones who cried the worst after the fire, and they made the most noise, and to suit them we have got a fire commission. But I tell you to compare the expense of running the fire department now with what it was ten years ago, and see where you are. We are going to strike bottom on this soon. The dulness of the times and the high rate of taxation are going to make the citizens object. You pinch a man's pocket and you hurt him. If you establish commissions and increase the expense of this government, you will have to stop some time. But you

have got to do something with the water department. It is in a sickly condition. Let us learn what is best, and I will vote for it."

On June 29 the ordinance was passed establishing the new Water Board. During the discussion Alderman Prescott alluded to Alderman Cutter as follows:

"The senior alderman from Ward 6 stated at the last meeting of this board that the only reason why that department was placed under a commission was that the people had lost confidence in the department as it was then conducted. The gentleman usually speaks from the book, and in this case was certainly not mistaken. He asks you to compare the expenses of running the fire department now with what they were ten years ago. I beg the board to first compare them with the expenses of last year, when we were attempting the folly of running such an immense department under the control of a committee of the City Council, the leading members of such committee being members of more than a dozen other important committees, thus preventing them from having anything like a practical knowledge of the inside workings of the department. No more conscientious, faithful or economical man ever sat at this board than the man who was last year chairman of the committee on the fire department, and who to-day is the senior member of this board. A faithful sentinel over the treasury, he was powerless then, as he is powerless to-day, over the departments of which he is chairman, the aggregate appropriations for which amount to millions of dollars. What have we for a department to-day under the Board of Fire Commissioners?"

On Aug. 3, 1874, orders authorizing the erection of a home for the poor on the Austin Farm, at a cost not exceeding \$385,000, and requesting the Committee on Finance to report an order providing the means. The question was on the passage of the orders. Alderman Cutter said:

"I do not like to oppose that motion, but it seems to me that this subject has been fully ventilated here. We have heard a great many remarks here, and most of them show sympathy for the poor. The alderman from Ward 12 thinks there are no accommodations for them. We bought Rainsford Island in 1870, and we have the almshouses in Charlestown and West Roxbury and Brighton, and the Marcella Street Hospital, with nothing in them, and yet gentlemen think we should spend half a million dollars for a home for the poor, with all these places on our hands. If you want to encourage poverty, this is the way to do it. The cities of Europe are emptying themselves into our midst. Cities and towns back of us will empty their paupers upon us. If you under-

take to put up a home to accommodate all the poor, you might as well erect one as large as the Pacific Mills. And yet the man who stands up and says a word against it is said to be hard-hearted.

"Gentlemen have taken wide scope in their discussions this afternoon, and no one has been called to order before. As a gentleman who looked at the drawing remarked to me, it looks more like a House of Parliament than a home for the poor. The gentlemen from South Boston pursue this question with zeal; they advocated the purchase of this lot, and I wish to correct the statement of the alderman from Ward 9, that the committee reported in favor of paying \$135,000 for this lot. No, sir, it was some members of that committee, but some other members opposed it and saved the city that expense. Delay saved the city then, and perhaps it will save something now. It is very well known that the directors of public institutions are shrewd men; they come here with requests for appropriations that exceed the cost of the buildings, and it is from the excess of previous appropriations that this one is to be built. The alderman says they asked for \$20,000 for a piggery. They always ask for more than a building will cost, but we have to tax the people for it all the same. Gentlemen have been prospecting about for a new building, and they speak of the need men have of work. Why, sir, near where I was born you will find the hills going to waste for want of labor; farms are suffering for want of some one to cultivate them, and yet while you tax the people here to keep men in idleness, you never can get men to go up there and cultivate the farms. Look at the way some of the towns treat their poor. They tell me that they give applicants for aid a meal and money enough to send them out of town, and we have to support them here.

"I am not suggesting a course unless necessity compels it. But we have to work, and the man who works and struggles hard all his life is very seldom a pauper, while if he squanders his time and indulges in strong drink, he often becomes a pauper. If you offer a premium on men to become paupers, they often do. We ought not to hold out inducements to people to become paupers. There are many poor persons who had rather starve than beg, while many who beg at our doors seem as healthy as ourselves. The question is whether the city is going to build such a structure as that and fill it at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars. We may take a stranger out there and exhibit an almshouse that holds 1,500 paupers; gentlemen may take pride in doing so, but I do not. I say the way the Board of Directors of Public Institutions is made



RESIDENCE, 2 GROVE PLACE,
1852—1855.

up to-day is not creditable to us; I would rather endorse a commission. Look at the money they have spent, and at the burdens they impose upon the people. Then look at our debt, at the suffering of the city by dulness of business, the depreciation of real estate and increase of taxes, and I say you are saddling an enormous expense upon the people by such an expenditure as this. I know no greater harm that can befall a city than the high rate of taxation."

On Sept. 1 the subject of the Home for the Poor was again under discussion. Alderman Cutter said:

"The gentleman from the Highlands seems to think that something will be gained by delay in this matter, and yet he would show by his statistics that delay is dangerous. He shows the multiplicity of our paupers, and yet he asks for delay. The Committee on Public Institutions have thoroughly sifted this case, and I do not see why he wants to sift it any more. It shows that he has not confidence in the report of that committee. I do not like to see gentlemen taking the back track. I do not think he has any right to stand up here and say no member of this board will object to building a home for the poor.

"He can soften his remarks if he chooses, but he insists that we must have more facilities. As the gentleman from Ward 17 said, we have a pauper house in Charlestown that is not half full, and we take boarders for nine dollars a week apiece from Cambridge and Somerville. We have also an empty pauper house in Brighton, and the Marcella Street Hospital is not occupied. They need not stay out of doors while we have such a poorhouse as Wilson's Hotel in Brighton unoccupied. Yet, with all these facilities, he would impose upon the taxpayers by building a house as large as any hotel at Saratoga to put our poor in. That is his idea of taking care of the poor. It is all very well if you are using your own money. But when you are doing it at the expense of others, I say beware how you act. Beware how you do it at the expense of taxpayers. No pauper of this city is out of doors to-day because of having no place to be taken care of in, and if we go on annexing as we have, and take in Cambridge, Chelsea and Somerville, as we may, there will be additional facilities. I do not know that there is any objection to the delay proposed by the gentleman's motion. Still, it is a milk-and-water motion. If this matter is sent back to the other branch, I know it will never get such a vote as it got before. I hear complaints that the merits of the question were not exhibited there, and when they are you will see more voting against it. So I apprehend that the more delay you have, the

more your case will be weakened. Yet those who favor the measure ask for delay, and I have no objections. I am informed that the members of the Board of Directors of Public Institutions, except those who reside in South Boston, oppose this location on the Austin Farm. I cannot say so from my own knowledge, but I have heard so.

"If the alderman will read the report of the committee of last year, he will see that my name is attached to the report in favor of a location on Neponset River. One reason why I voted for that farm was to prevent the buying of this one at twice its valuation. I think I can claim some credit for saving the city \$60,000, for if I had attached my name to the report in favor of this farm, I believe it would have been bought, as I saw that members were bound to buy some farm. We need not lose anything on this place. I think it is an improper place on which to erect a home for the poor. The access to it will be difficult; the transportation of supplies will be heavy and expensive, while we could transport them to Neponset by rail or steam."

On Nov. 2 an order for the mayor to petition the Legislature for authority to take land for a public park or parks, by commissioners appointed by the mayor. Alderman Cutter moved that the order be laid on the table and gave his reason as follows:

"I made the motion to lay on the table because, like all other cases which it is desired to push through on their demerits instead of their merits, it is put in here at the last moment; and an attempt is made to force it through without due consideration. I beg the board to pause before they launch out on this extravagant measure. The gentleman from Ward 12 says it will do no harm. The same remark is made of every order for the mayor to petition for legislative authority. I have watched the result in this board, and I know that now is the time for doing harm. Pass this order and we will commit the city to a large expenditure and add twenty millions to our debt. Does not that do harm? We have other large expenditures to make; we will have to provide a Court House; we must secure an adequate water supply, which to-day is running very low. It becomes us to look out for the necessities for our families; we must provide beef and pork and other necessities before we indulge in luxuries. It will be in bad taste for this board to commit the City Council to this scheme, which is pushed by men who have land to sell; it comes in here, not with any public interest at its back, but in the interests of private speculators. Where are your petitioners for a park? Where is the report of your park commission? Have they

given you any intelligence upon this subject? What were they appointed for, if it was not to gain information on this subject and report to the city government? We have heard nothing from them, and yet we are asked to push this thing through, at the last moment, without a moment's consideration. I say it is in bad taste for this board to do so."

Nov. 16 the Charles River water supply was under consideration. Alderman Cutter's views are as follows:

"I beg to differ with the gentleman from Ward 8. I shall favor no water but the best and the largest quantity, and that we shall get from Sudbury River. It is known that the Charles River is discolored by the washings from the mills, and that reservoirs cannot be made on that river without destroying the village of Dedham. The gentleman from Ward 8 knows the impracticability of storing water in that locality. The grade is so low and the land so level that the water will flow over a large number of acres, and the vegetable matter will affect the taste of the water; besides, it will destroy the village of Dedham. While I am willing and want to give the city of Boston all the water it needs, I am not willing to stand up here and carry out what I believe to be wrong. I do not believe it is the way to meet this question, and I am sorry to see the chairman of the Water Committee taking the stand he does. Let us take the best water we can get. We can get Sudbury River in twenty-four hours if we only say so. We have already spent money for it. I am familiar with the water question, and so is the gentleman from Ward 8, and I hope he will stand up and vote right. The gentleman from Ward 17 says he will vote for anything; if he was familiar with the subject, he would not say so.

"The objection I have to the Charles River is that it hardly moves; there is scarcely a ripple perceptible on its surface. Take a river with not enough current to cause a ripple, and impurities congregate in the bed. You see no grass growing at the bottom of Sudbury River, because the current runs fast enough to destroy the grass. When you dam up Charles River, you flood all that district. The difficulty is that the water question is one that gentlemen talk about without knowing anything of it. What does the doctors' report amount to? The chemists' report is the one to study to learn the different qualities of the water. I say we should get the best water we can, and get water where we shall not have to pump it. If we take Charles River, we have got to pump it, and the gentlemen know the expense of pumping. We can take water from Sudbury River without pumping, and have a pitch nine feet greater than that of the pres-

ent conduit. That is the best scheme for the citizens of Boston to adopt, because it is the best.

"The gentleman seems to think that the Water Board are desirous of making us do this thing. The Water Board do what this board and the Common Council direct them to do. We gave them \$500,000 to spend, and they are spending it for that purpose. The gentleman says it will cost ten millions; the highest estimate I have seen is seven millions. The damages that will occur to the town of Dedham, and the amount of land we would cover by taking Charles River, would, in my judgment, amount to more than the cost of taking Sudbury River. The gentleman does not give us any figures; he does not know that we will save a cent by taking Charles River; he does not know the expense of pumping water. We have got to pump water at Lake Cochituate now, and this city is liable to be short of water within two months. And yet this water question has been dragging along, and no attention has been paid to it. When this city gets out of water, somebody has got to take the responsibility for it."

On Dec. 21 the subject of Boston water power and Back Bay streets was brought up. The views of Alderman Cutter were as follows:

"We now seem to be obtaining some light on this subject. This committee appeared here at our last meeting and said they had had this subject under consideration for the last year, and were fully conversant with it. It now appears that that was not the case, and that the alderman from the Highland District now represents only five of the committee, and that one member has seen fit to make a very sensible minority report. I am somewhat surprised at the hurry and rush with which the committee tried to obtain a vote at the last meeting. I see by this contract that we have nothing to do with the water-power company, but that we have to pay Munson a sum of money in case he does certain things. Now, has he done what he agreed to do? He has not. He did not complete the contract in the specified time, and it is not done to-day; and we do not know how long it will take to do it. The grade damages are not provided for, and it would be difficult for this board to know, even if the case were settled by equity and not by contract, whether or not we owe a single cent. It is taking \$100,000 out of our treasury, which we never could get back, and giving it to a company which is bankrupt to-day; and if I understand the pith of the remarks of the gentleman from the Highlands, it is to enliven it up a little. If we do this in one case, we might have scores of people coming here and asking for it. I say that as guardians of the city's money we should violate the oath we have taken if we went

on and paid this company this money. As for the equity of the streets, it is for the interest of all concerned that the city should have them; it is for the interest of Mr. Munson and the water-power company that the city should have those streets. In my judgment the city should never have been compelled to pay for the building of those streets, and in looking back at the records of 1871 I find my name among those voting against it. But we must take things as they are to-day. We have a contract with a certain party, and our duty is to faithfully perform it.

"It seems to me very singular that this matter should be brought in here at the end of the year. If you, gentlemen, continue in the government as many years as I have, I pray you to watch what comes in during the last moments of the year. It is something that will not bear offering here earlier in the year. Now the gentleman from the Highlands has stated his case no better than he could have done if he were a paid attorney for that company. The question, as he says, is, are we to aid and favor them, or not? That is the question. That is the cause of the hurry. It is not to do the business of the city in a proper manner, but are you to aid and favor them? That is for you, gentlemen, to decide. The gentleman from the Highlands speaks of the anxiety of committees to close up their business at the end of the year; but I have failed to see a member of this board so anxious to close up the city's money in the treasury as he is. No, he not only proposes to close up the business of the committees, but to close up every dollar in the treasury by aiding corporations not able to aid themselves, whose credit is gone, and who have made a contract to build those streets, but that bankrupt concern is not able to complete it. Then he says the 'alderman from Ward 6 growls, as he expected he would.' I should think he would expect any honest member of the board to growl. It is an honest growl. We recommitted this report to the committee last Thursday, and they say we have saved fifty per cent. But have we saved it? They report a hundred thousand dollars now; they reported two hundred thousand then. Is that a saving of fifty per cent? If it is recommitted again, perhaps we would save another fifty per cent, and they would come in here and ask for fifty thousand dollars. But, gentlemen, do not be deceived. We do not save fifty per cent. From the alderman's remarks, there are \$60,000 due the city for taxes, and \$17,000 paid to William Gray, making \$77,000, which, subtracted from \$100,000, is all we should have to pay. The only difference then between this order to-day and the one reported last Thursday is \$23,000, for we would only have had to pay \$123,000 if we had passed the order

for \$200,000. That is their entire argument. The gentleman says that the money is due to the company from the city. How does he make that out? If it is due, it is by virtue of the contract, and by the terms of the contract it is not due till the work is all done; and therefore he makes a mistake when he says it is due to them. And he compares it to the Hoosac Tunnel. The difference is that the tunnel contractors kept at work right along, while this company has stopped work for nearly a year. That is the difference. The State was dealing with a live firm and not a dead corporation. If gentlemen see these facts, they cannot get over them. They may bring in the play of the 'Merchant of Venice' to help them out of the argument, and they may tell about honest members growling, but that does not affect the facts at all. It is a weak argument, and no man resorts to a weak argument except when he has a weak case."

On Dec. 23 the board took up the special assignment, viz., the report of Committee on Streets recommending the passage of the resolve and order for the laying out and extension of Swett Street, at an adjudged expense of \$475,000, the question being on the passage of the order. Alderman Cutter said:

"I look upon the extension of Swett Street as only a question of time; and I believe it is necessary to have that street laid out—there is no doubt about it; but as every judicious man would control his business according to its extent, and would carefully protect himself against failure or increasing his debt so that he would be troubled to pay it, it does look to me that, in the present state of business in this city, and as the city within the past three years has spent some eleven million nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars in widening and laying out streets, I think it would be judicious to delay this matter. I do not see that it will harm anybody to delay it. There is no more public necessity for it than there was a year ago, and the question is whether or not we are going on and continuing to run the city into debt, and whether it is good policy to continue during the next three years as we have the last three, and spend nearly twelve millions in increasing the debt of this city. It does look to me as if it were about time for us to pause. The rate of taxes in this city has increased, and the valuation has been increased; and now that the valuation has got to be put down, the rates are still more increased, because personal property is falling off, and gentlemen who were citizens of this city have taken up their residence outside our limits for the purpose of protecting themselves from the extravagance of this government, and they dwell in some locality where this government cannot reach them.

Then, of course, it falls upon us who own the real estate of the city to meet this increased taxation. The income from real estate in the city has fallen off a great deal of late, business is dull, and tenants are unable to pay what they have been paying. It is certainly adding an expense upon real estate owners that will not be tolerated by the citizens. They have come to the conclusion that they must effect a revolution; that the city government must and shall stop spending money in this way. I see, to-day, that the Committee on Ordinances recommend an increase of two more salaried officers in the city solicitor's department—that is just so much more expense. We have increased them during the last two years, from one to four, and now they ask to be increased to six. If you keep on this way, you will get half the bar employed by the city of Boston. Whoever you employ, you have got to pay. I think we had better pause before we increase the expenses of this government by widening and extending any more streets at present. I, for one, shall feel it my duty to vote against this order at the present time.

"It is all very well for the gentleman to talk about increasing the value of individuals' property by using the city's money, for that is his argument, if he has offered any—it is to increase the value of their property. Well, now, the water-power company have been making and extending streets, and for the last year they have not been able to sell a dollar's worth of land. Now, they extended those streets for the purpose of selling land, but they cannot sell it. And why? Because there is no demand for it. And it is almost useless for us to extend this street, for if we do we cannot realize anything in the taxation of that property for the next five or ten years, and therefore there is no necessity for doing it for the next five or ten years. It is not expected that the city should bear four-fifths of the expense when the private individuals will have nine-tenths of the benefit of it, and that seems to be the bargain the Committee on Streets have put before us. That argument can be used in regard to any street in the city. There is Columbus Avenue, which stops nowhere except against a man's yard fence; that could be extended as well as Swett Street. Why not? There is an avenue where there is a great deal of travel, and if it were extended into the country in the condition it now is, perhaps it would satisfy the gentleman from the Highlands, so that hereafter he would not advocate spending millions of money for a public park. I say we cannot, in the condition we are now in, afford to go on and do this work, although I admit that it is only a question of time when it will have to be done. But there is no public necessity for it—not half

so much as there was two years ago, when the pressure upon our streets by business was greater than it is now. If people travelled over Dover Street bridge to South Boston two years, they can do it as well to-day, and for the next year to come, and it will be no greater hardship. But there is another hardship. It is brought in here just at the last moments of the year, at a regular meeting, and put before this board for a final action at an irregular meeting, and they propose to pass it, giving us only from last Monday night to to-night to study into the merits of this question. Certainly this Committee on Streets cannot boast of the merit of being conversant with subjects put before this board, when you all know the action they were obliged to take in order to take \$200,000 from the treasury for the water-power company, stating that they were conversant with the subject and had been for a year; and although they opposed recommitting their report to the committee because it was useless—the discussion showed that they did lack intelligence on the subject—they themselves voted to recommit, and not a member of this board voted against it. I say that after the Committee on Streets have come in in this loose way, it behooves us to look after them, and not pass an order that involves half a million with only three or four days for its consideration. This board should have more time than that, and it is not good taste in the committee to press this order at this particular time. They have not confidence in the order; if they had, they would not press it. The gentleman from the Highlands says that if it is not passed now, it probably will not be passed for several years. Did he tell us why not? He did not, and therefore the only salvation of the order is to rush it through now. It will not bear time.”

Dec. 28 an ordinance to amend ordinance relating to the law department, so as to authorize the appointment of an additional assistant solicitor, to be called the “city conveyancer,” and another to be called the “legislative counsel;” also to authorize the Committee on Ordinances to employ, whenever the exigency arises, extra counsel for management of city causes, came up in the regular order among unfinished business, the question being upon the passage of the ordinance. Alderman Cutter spoke at length as follows:

“I desire, as one member of this board, that the committee who saw fit to offer this ordinance should give some explanation of it.

“It seems to me, then, that the Committee on Ordinances have listened to the wishes of the city solicitor’s department, and are desirous of gratifying those wishes, from their statement. They have come here



RESIDENCE, 14 GROVE STREET
1855 — 1864.

every year for assistance; there is no harm in that; the harm is in granting all they desire. Now, as regards the prospective wants of the city in the future: Every alderman will admit that we have no improvements in view on the Suffolk or Church Street districts, where there are many titles to be examined before the real estate can be conveyed to the city. The times do not demand such improvements in the future, and of course we shall not demand so much service from the city solicitor. Such improvements, I trust, have come to an end, and we are not going to spend money as freely as we have during the past three years, and in that case we shall not need the opinion and labor of the city solicitor as much as we have for three years. I always notice, if you establish or increase a salaried office in this City Hall, you do not abolish it; once established, it can never be abolished. We have one city solicitor and three assistants, and I desire to inform the gentleman that we have paid out \$1,400 this last year for extra assistance. I hoped to obtain that information from the committee, but fearing I would not, I got it elsewhere. If you employ two more officers, you will not pay them less than \$4,000, as it will not do to employ cheap lawyers, and it is safe to say we will increase the expense of this department \$5,000 for what we have got on with for \$1,400 this year. I think the Committee on Claims have had authority to employ extra help in the city solicitor's department when it is needed; and as to the cases in Dedham, I venture to say that the city solicitor of West Roxbury will be employed, and he will bring in his bill, and the city will have to pay it. The solicitors of Charlestown and Brighton are better acquainted with the cases from there, and it would be better to employ them; so if you appoint two more solicitors, it will not help you any on these cases that accumulated by annexation. I see that the Committee on Ordinances have thought proper, when emergency calls for it, to employ additional help, and it does seem to me that that is the best way to have it. When the Legislature is in session, it is supposed that the Committee on Legislative Matters of the board will attend to those duties with such assistance as they can obtain from Mr. Stackpole, and no new assistant who could be appointed would add any weight or strength to them. If this board are conversant with that department, I hope they will not pass this ordinance; and if they are not, I hope they will make themselves so before passing it.

"I am satisfied that if you appoint a new man to do this legislative business other than Mr. Stackpole, the city's interest will suffer. That is my judgment. He is the man of all others that should do this work. I

am surprised that gentlemen of this board, who seem to have streaks of economy, should be willing, as the alderman from Ward 9 seems to be, to increase the expenses of this government by employing more salaried officers, and to give us only the short time since the last meeting to look into this matter, which was ordered to be printed at the last meeting and laid over, and we have not had time to look into the merits of the case.

"I would like to say a word in reply to the gentleman last up. He talks about the Northampton Street district as compared with the Suffolk Street district. The city has not taken the Northampton Street district, and it has nothing to do with the conveyances. The city took the Suffolk Street district and reconveyed it to the owners. There is no such work on the Northampton Street district; the alderman from Ward 9 knows it, and he should not convey such an impression to this board. The work of conveyancing on the Church and Suffolk Street districts was enormous. There are no improvements suggested that will demand such assistance from the city solicitor's department, because these improvements have virtually come to an end. The times do not allow the spending of money as it has been done in the last few years. As to the cases in the Supreme Court, the gentleman knows you can try but one case at a time, and you must take a case in its regular order, and there is no need for extra help there. The city solicitor can attend to the Supreme Court alone. They are not blocked up in the other courts, and when they are, they come to the Committee on Claims, who never refused to give what they needed. We can go on in that way in the future as we have in the past. This is only establishing two salaried officers which will cost \$5,000 a year."

Dec. 31 the subject of the law department was again brought up, Alderman Cutter discussing as follows:

"My reasons are that the amendment just adopted covers the whole ground; it allows the mayor and Committee on Claims to employ all necessary assistance, which will provide for all the necessary wants of the law department. Section 1 proposes to establish an additional salaried officer, and of course after it is established it is permanent and difficult to be abolished, for no matter how little an officer may do, he will have friends enough to prevent its abolition. As I stated at our last meeting, the business will not be so great in the future as it has been in the past few years, and the work of conveyancing and examining titles will not be so great. We had more of such work to do on the Suffolk Street district than we shall probably have in the next two years to come. The

Church Street district also made a large amount of business for the city solicitor's department. They have done it, and done it well, with one solicitor and three assistants, and I have yet to learn that there is any suffering in the department for additional help to be added. The Committee on Ordinances paid out, I learn from the auditor, about \$1,400 this year, and as this officer will have to receive \$2,500 or \$3,000 for what we got done for \$1,400, I think it will be economy not to adopt this section.

"I wish to disclaim any argument against employing a proper number of counsel. That is what we propose to do, but not to add an additional permanent force to the city solicitor's department. This is not always the best way to get the best counsel. You can hire better counsel than perhaps would take that position if it was offered to them, and it would be better for the city to do so. I do not propose to see the city government harmed by not employing proper legal counsel; but I do propose to oppose this continual adding on of salaried officers. If you continue in this way, you will perhaps make half of the Suffolk bar assistant solicitors. The gentleman speaks of the Water Board, of which I am a member, and I have yet to know of their asking the whole time of an assistant solicitor. I think for \$2,500 we should get more time from a man than to attend the meetings of that board. Neither do I receive communications asking me to favor this because my friend will probably receive the office if it is created. The gentleman from Ward 6 says in generalities that we must protect the city's interests. I say we have got to do it. But he does not give us the magnitude of the business compared with two years ago. It may be less. If it is, his argument fails and there is no virtue in it. The question is in going on. Since I have been in the board, one or two assistants have been added. I say the city cannot afford to pay for a man's services in this way unless there is an absolute necessity for it. If there is an absolute necessity for it, we can hire legal talent at any time."

On Jan. 2, 1875, was held the last meeting of the board for the year. Thanks were offered to the mayor by Alderman Emery and responded to by the mayor, also thanks to the chairman by Alderman Cutter as follows:

"Resolved, That the thanks of this board are due, and they are hereby tendered to John T. Clark, Esq., for his constant attendance at its meetings and for the deep interest he has manifested in the important transactions of the board, and also for the patience and forbearance in which, as chairman, he has guided the deliberations of his associates during the past year.

"I do not know, sir, that I can add anything to the language of the resolution that will make it any more in unison with the feelings of my own heart or the hearts of my associates. I think every one will agree with me in the indorsement of that resolution. Having been chairman of the board, I am familiar with the arduous duties of the position. None except those who have performed those duties know how arduous they are. I do not know of a position in any legislative body in this country which equals the duties of the chairman of this Board of Aldermen. I take particular pleasure, Mr. Mayor, in having the opportunity to render my testimony—which has been fully confirmed by experience—to the honesty and integrity of our chairman. Our meetings have been lengthy, and we have done our duty. No Board of Aldermen, in my judgment, has done any more duty towards the subjects presented here than we have. We, perhaps, may have been called the debating Board of Aldermen. Every subject has been thoroughly ventilated, and we have expressed and interchanged our ideas with one another; and while people who are, perhaps, not familiar with the duties of the board may think we discuss subjects longer and more than is necessary, in my judgment, the more you discuss them, the better you are acquainted with and more competent to vote upon them. We have had an unusual latitude in debate, through the forbearance of our chairman, which, in my judgment, has resulted in good to the city of Boston. Mr. Mayor, this is the close of my service in this City Hall. I feel sad, although I experience a sense of joy to know that I am no longer bound to come here day after day, as I have for the last four years. Yet I feel pleased to know that the duties are left upon the shoulders of men who have been elected here for the coming year, whom we can rely upon. In my judgment, those duties will be well performed. This, sir, is the close of the fourth year of my association with this City Hall. The present chairman has been associated with me the past three years, and I have found him a social companion and a good man to fill the position of alderman; and I rejoice that he has been elected for the year to come."

The resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote. After the chairman's address, Alderman Cutter moved the adjournment of the board *sine die*.

Thus closed, after four consecutive years of faithful service, my father's connection with the city government, a connection which shows in all its lines honesty and sagacity and the same interest in managing city business that he always showed in his own. His

personal business suffered during these years, but he enjoyed the companionship of those with whom he was connected, and although he worked hard, it was a pleasure to him which he greatly enjoyed recalling as years passed. He never ceased to extol the honesty of those associates which especially appealed to him. I will close this chapter with two letters which I have received from men who were connected with him during these years. The first is from Mr. Samuel F. McCleary, who for years was most faithful as city clerk, and during these years occurred the four when my father was a member of the Board of Aldermen. He says:

"After a service of several years as an assessor for the city of Boston, Leonard R. Cutter was elected by his fellow-citizens, in 1870, an alderman of said city, in which capacity he served for four consecutive years. In the various enterprises of the city government involving large transactions affecting the real estate within the city, especially such as followed the great fire in 1872, his judgment was especially sought, and his experience, acquired while he was an assessor, became of great value to the city. Successful as a business man, he became a wise and safe counsellor. A conservative by habit, he was very independent in thought and deed. Careful about expenditures, he acted for the best interest of the taxpayers. He never countenanced by word or presence any of those questionable expenses for selfish enjoyment which in his day were so frequently made contingent upon official duties. Tenacious of his opinion, he never yielded his settled judgment to expediency or compromise. Such sterling qualities created for him the enmity and oppositon of some men, who could never make him swerve from his ideas of propriety or rectitude. Paying a large tax himself, he was a trustworthy steward for the public interest, and was a prudent trustee of its funds. Though a Democrat upon national issues, he disregarded political opinions in the administration of his public duties. He spoke but rarely in the Board of Aldermen. Though his presence was fine, he had not the warmth and magnetism of most public speakers. His most effective work was done in the committee room and in private consultation with his associates."

The second is from Hon. Henry L. Pierce, who was mayor during the third year of my father's service, and whose character my father highly esteemed.

158 State Street, Boston, Nov. 22, 1895.

Dear Mrs. Bigelow:

I regret that want of time prevents me from responding as fully as I would like to your request for some account of your father's services as

alderman, acting mayor and water commissioner of the city of Boston. The citizens of Boston owe a debt of gratitude to him for long and faithful services, for which he received no compensation beyond the consciousness of duty well performed. He had a high standard of civic virtue, to which he adhered through good report and through evil report. His honesty and integrity of purpose were never called in question, even by his political opponents. The city was engaged in many important enterprises during his connection with the government, and his practical knowledge of business affairs was of good and lasting service in carrying them on efficiently and economically.

As chairman of the Board of Aldermen, he became acting mayor when I withdrew from the office, before the expiration of my term, in order to take my seat as a representative in Congress; and although not of the same political faith, it was with a feeling of the utmost confidence and satisfaction that I saw him installed in the mayor's office as my temporary successor.

Very truly yours,

HENRY L. PIERCE.

Such letters from such reliable sources speak for themselves, and prove the truth of the old adage that "Honesty is the best policy."

CHAPTER VII.

CONNECTION WITH WATER BOARD.

1871-1883.

On Jan. 23, 1871, Mr. Leonard R. Cutter of the Board of Aldermen and Messrs. Sidney Squires and Amos L. Noyes of the council were chosen members of the Water Board for the municipal year. On Jan. 4 of the same year Mr. Charles H. Allen was elected president of the board. Feb. 1 the following committees were appointed: Eastern Division, Messrs. Lewis, Haven and Squires; Western Division, the president and Messrs. Cutter and Noyes; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. Haven, Allen and Squires; Chestnut Hill Reservoir, Messrs. Bradlee, Lewis and Allen. Feb. 16 Mr. William F. Davis re-elected water registrar by the City Council.

During the year the various matters of business were duly transacted referring to new pipes, meters, etc., and on July 18 the mayor approved an order accepting the act entitled "An act in addition to an act to authorize the city of Boston to build an additional reservoir." Passed April 14, 1871. This act was to give authority to the city to lay new mains.

On Dec. 21 an order passed the council asking the board to consider whether Beacon Hill reservoir is longer needed.

On Dec. 23 the board held a meeting, at which residents in the vicinity of the reservoir were present and remonstrated against its removal. The board voted that "they deemed it best to delay for the present any action on their part towards recommending its sale or discontinuance."

In the month of January the Board were so much alarmed by the long-continued drought and the consequent low state of the water that they purchased engines and two Andrews pumps and placed them in position for use in forcing water from the lower and deeper parts of Lake Cochituate into the conduit. The citizens, realizing the importance of the subject, adopted a rigid system of economy, and were thus enabled to continue the requisite supply without resorting to the use of the pumps. The lowest point (4 10-12 feet) was reached on the eighteenth day of February, 1871. That the twelvemonth ending April 30, 1871, was remarkable as a year of short supply of water will be more fully realized

by comparison. The average depth of the water of the lake for the year ending April 30, 1870, was 12 20-100 feet above the bottom of the conduit, while the average for the year ending April 30, 1871, was only 8 92-100 feet.

"The average daily consumption has been 15,007,700 gallons, being a decrease of 62,700 gallons as compared with the previous year. This decrease can only be accounted for by the fact that the citizens were fully aware of the diminished supply, and regulated its use accordingly.

"The income from water rates has been \$734,790.74, being an increase over the previous year of \$105,339.26, and the estimated income for year ending April 30, 1872, is \$750,000.

"The high-service supply, which worked so well in the Highland District, was made applicable to the supply on Beacon Hill, and the water was let on the fourth of June last year. Since the sixth of June the water has been in use, and has proved adequate to the supply of the dwellings in their upper stories.

"The Beacon Hill reservoir, having been superseded in the supply of that section of the city by the high service, will no longer be needed, and the board will recommend its sale at a proper time. Its capacity is only that of one-fifth of a day's supply to the city, and with the laying of the proposed forty-eight-inch main to the city direct from the Chestnut Hill reservoir, the supply of water, it is believed, will be equal to any emergency which will require the use of this reservoir for reserve purposes in storage of water. The sale of this property, it is anticipated, will realize a sum sufficient to pay the cost of laying the new main from the Chestnut Hill reservoir.

"The Bradlee basin was completed, and a formal letting on of water took place on the twenty-fifth of October last, the twenty-second anniversary of the introduction of the Cochituate water into the city. The water was allowed to flow in a portion of each day until Nov. 2, when the low stage of water in the lake required its cessation until March. From the fourteenth of March to the first of May all of the water not needed for the daily supply of the city was allowed to flow into the basin. On the first of May the depth of water was about fourteen feet. The capacity of the Bradlee basin is 550,583,485 gallons, and of the Lawrence basin, 180,888,944 gallons.

"The number of meters now applied to the premises of the water-takers is one thousand and seventy-six, being a decrease from last year of thirteen."



PLACE OF BUSINESS, 77 AND 67 LEVERETT STREET.

1858—1894.

1872.

On Feb. 5, 1872, Mr. Leonard R. Cutter and Messrs. Amos L. Noyes and Charles H. Hersey of the Common Council were elected members of the Water Board for the municipal year. Mr. Hersey was appointed Feb. 7. on the Committee in Eastern Division and Water Registrar's Department, in place of Mr. Squires.

On April 8 Mr. N. J. Bradlee resigned from the board, of which he had been a member for nine consecutive years. Appropriate resolutions were passed.

April 15 Messrs. John A. Haven and Edward A. White were elected by the City Council members of the board for two years, from the first Monday in May.

May 2 Mr. Alexander Wadsworth was elected for one year, in place of Mr. N. J. Bradlee.

May 6 the board was called together to organize, when the following officers were elected: president, Charles H. Allen; Eastern Division, Messrs. Haven, Hersey and White; Western Division, Messrs. Wadsworth, Cutter and Noyes; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. White, Hersey and Allen; New Supply of Water, president and Messrs. Haven and Wadsworth; Chestnut Hill Reservoir, Messrs. Cutter, Noyes and Haven; superintendent Eastern Division, E. R. Jones; superintendent Western Division, Albert Stanwood; clerk, J. A. Wiggin.

In their annual report to the City Council the board refer to the following matters:

The steps taken to secure an additional supply of water.

The subsequent choice of Sudbury River as a source of supply.

On Oct. 20, 1871, the mayor approved an order appropriating \$10,000 for the use of the Cochituate Water Board in making surveys and inquiries in regard to additional supply of pure water. On Nov. 15 the board secured the services of Mr. Joseph P. Davis as engineer, and on Nov. 22 Mr. Davis began his work of making surveys, estimates, plans, etc., for the new supply. Among the instructions given the engineer by the board was the following:

"To make an examination of all the feasible sources of water supply within fifty miles of Boston, with reference to several matters, among them the immediate necessity of a temporary additional supply to avert the threatened deficiency of the coming season."

On Feb. 13, 1872, Mr. Davis made a verbal report to the board, and on April 6, in consequence of the recommendation of the engineer, the

"Sudbury River Act" was secured. On the same day the board directed Mr. Davis to begin at once the work of making a temporary connection between the Sudbury River and Lake Cochituate.

These were the first steps in the new supply system, which resulted in the three basins built in Framingham, in the construction of which and the incidental damage suits brought against the city of Boston my father was intensely interested, and was always delighted to recount the numerous experiences he had at that time.

1873.

On Jan. 23, 1873, Alderman Leonard R. Cutter and Councilmen William G. Thacher and Edward P. Wilbur were elected members of the Board for the municipal year.

The Committee on Western Division reported "that Mr. Stanwood having expressed a desire to resign his position as superintendent of the Western Division, they had considered the matter, and had decided that Mr. Fitzgerald, now in the employ of the B. & A. R. R. Co. as civil engineer, was the most suitable person for the position.

"Voted, That Mr. Fitzgerald be appointed assistant superintendent of the Western Division."

On May 5 the board organized, and the following officers were elected: president, John A. Haven; superintendent Eastern Division, E. R. Jones; superintendent Western Division, A. Stanwood; clerk, J. A. Wiggin; Eastern Division, Messrs. White, Wilbur and Gogin; Western Division, Messrs. McLean, Cutter and Thacher; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. Gogin, Thacher and Wilbur; New Supply, president and Messrs. White and McLean; Chestnut Hill Reservoir, Messrs. Cutter, Wilbur and Haven.

During this year, among other items in the report are found the following: preparation for beginning work on the "new supply," the laying of 94,046 feet of main pipe, the laying of 2,195 feet of service pipes, completion of the high service to South Boston, completion in August of a connection with the Mystic works.

1874.

Jan. 19 Alderman Leonard R. Cutter and Councilmen Edward P. Wilbur and W. G. Thacher were elected for the municipal year to the Water Board. May 4 Mr. John A. Haven was re-elected president of the Water Board. On July 9 Mr. Walter E. Swan was elected clerk of the

board, in place of Mr. J. A. Wiggin, resigned. On Nov. 30 Mr. Edward A. White was elected a member of the Water Board for two years, from the first Monday in May, 1874, and on Dec. 7 Mr. L. Miles Standish was elected for the same term. Dec. 17 Mr. Thomas Gogin, who had been serving as president for some time, was elected president of the board.

At a special meeting held Dec. 19 the following committees were appointed: Eastern Division, Messrs. White, Standish and Thacher; Western Division, Messrs. McLean, Cutter and Wilbur; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. Standish, Thacher and Wilbur; New Supply, the president and Messrs. McLean and Standish.

Nov. 16, 1874, General B. F. Butler sent a communication to the City Council from the Wamesit Power Company, in behalf of the other mills on the Concord River, tendering to the city, during the winter, so much of the Sudbury River as its necessities might require.

Nov. 28 an order was approved authorizing the board "to obtain the assent in writing of all parties owning rights or privileges in the waters of the Sudbury River, for the diversion of said waters into Lake Cochituate, for the use of the city of Boston during such period as may be agreed upon by the said owners and the said Water Board; and upon the assent of all the owners as aforesaid the Cochituate Water Board is hereby authorized to divert the waters of Sudbury River into Lake Cochituate in such manner as they may deem expedient, the expense to be charged to the appropriation for the Cochituate Water Department."

The board, after consultation with the city solicitor, sent an agent to the parties interested, who all declined to ratify the offer which had been made, with one exception. On Dec. 7 this information was transmitted to the council, who passed a vote of thanks to General B. F. Butler for his generous offer.

1875.

The council having authorized the Board, Jan. 2, to seize the water of the Sudbury River, the Board met Jan. 5 to consider what steps were necessary to keep up a temporary supply, etc. The city engineer and city solicitor were present in consultation. It was finally voted to authorize the Committee on New Supply to see the owners of land on the line of the temporary connection between Farm Pond and the lake, to make arrangements with them for the maintenance of the temporary works for a term of five years. On Jan. 7 this permission having been obtained, the Board voted to have the ditch cleared of ice, and the Sudbury River turned into the lake.

On Jan. 21 the mayor and members of the Water Board signed the formal taking of the Sudbury River, and on the same day the city engineer, by authority of the board, turned the water into the lake.

In the annual report of the Cochituate Water Board for 1873-74 is noted the appropriation of \$500,000 for new supply,—the Sudbury River plan. Estimated cost of new supply, \$5,150,000. Time required for construction, three full working seasons. Cost per million gallons, \$21.17. This service will furnish a supply of 40,000,000 gallons daily in the driest season.

The Water Board has no hesitation in reaffirming its opinion, fully expressed in former reports, in favor of that plan of supply adopted by the City Council of 1873. The act passed by the Legislature, granting the Sudbury River to the city, is a very favorable and valuable one; the watershed is singularly free from sources of pollution, and, if any are found to exist, can be easily controlled; the water is excellent, and the storage facilities very favorable, while the cost—predicated upon actual and intelligent surveys—is not large, considering that our citizens will, with it, beyond all question, secure what they all desire,—an adequate supply of pure water for the next fifty years.

Mr. Thomas Gogin and Mr. Leonard R. Cutter having been elected members at large of the Water Board by the City Council, the board was called together on May 3, 1875, to organize. The following officers were elected: president, Thomas Gogin; clerk, Walter E. Swan; superintendent Eastern Division, Ezekiel R. Jones; superintendent Western Division, Desmond Fitzgerald.

On May 6 the following committees were appointed: Eastern Division, Messrs. White, Standish and Thacher; Western Division, Messrs. Cutter, Prescott and Noyes; New Supply, Messrs. Gogin, Cutter and Standish; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. Gogin, Cutter and Standish.

May 31 Mr. Thomas Gogin resigned, and Mr. L. Miles Standish was elected president *pro tem*. June 8, and on Aug. 5 was elected president. July 12 Mr. Charles E. Powers was elected a member of the Water Board by the City Council, in place of Mr. Thomas Gogin, resigned.

From Mr. Davis's report to the Water Board I quote the following:

"Early in October of this year complaint began to be made that the Cochituate water tasted badly and was unfit for use. The taste was variously described; some persons thought it like cucumbers, others like fish oil, still others like dead leaves, etc., but as a rule it was spoken of

as a 'cucumber taste.' Upon investigation it was found to be confined to water in the pipes at first, but it was afterwards discovered in all parts of the Bradlee basin of the Chestnut Hill reservoir. This basin was shut off from the city supply and the taste gradually disappeared, and on April 1 the gate was again opened and water let into the city. No cause for the taste could be assigned."

April 12 the mayor approved the order appropriating \$4,500,000 for the new works.

The following is the order:

"Ordered, That the Cochituate Water Board be and it is hereby authorized to contract for building the whole of the aqueduct between Sudbury River and Chestnut Hill reservoir, and the works connected therewith, and also for constructing the three reservoirs designated in the order of the City Council, approved the twenty-sixth of February, 1875, and the works connected therewith necessary for storing and purifying the waters of Sudbury River, the appropriations of money heretofore made for the 'additional supply of water' to be applied in making payments on account of said contracts and of other expenses incurred by said board under the authority of the orders of the City Council, approved the eleventh of April, 1873, the second of January, 1875, and the twenty-sixth of February, 1875; provided, however, that the contracts herein authorized shall be made in the manner specified in the said order of the City Council, approved the twenty-sixth of February, 1875; and provided, also, that the estimated expense of the work to be performed under all of said contracts, including the contracts entered into under the authority of the said order of the City Council, approved the twenty-sixth of February, 1875, shall not exceed the sum of \$4,500,000."

Nov. 23 the Committee on New Supply, after several interviews with General B. F. Butler, made a report to the Board, when it was

"Voted, That the Committee on Additional Supply be authorized to settle with General B. F. Butler, acting for himself and the Wamesit Power Company of Lowell, for a sum not exceeding fifty-five thousand dollars; provided, a full release be given to the city of Boston by said company, satisfactory to the city solicitor, from every and all damages, compensation and claim of damages, of whatever name and nature, arising out of or because of the taking by said city of the water of Sudbury River, and provided also that an absolute conveyance be given to said city of a certain quantity of water, equal to 66-288 (but never exceeding 66 cubic feet per second) of the water flowing in the canal of said company, when

the water is below the top of the permanent stone dam of said company; said water to be drawn only for eleven and one-quarter hours per day, for six days in each week.

"The said sum to include, also, a retainer for the personal legal services of the said General Butler, for any and all suits which may be brought against said city by any and all parties, on account of the taking of the water of said Sudbury River by said city. And that said committee be further authorized to offer twenty thousand dollars additional to the above sum of fifty-five thousand dollars, to said General Butler, acting for said Wamesit Power Company, in case the said quantity of water flowing in the canal can be offset, in whole or in part, for the rightful and legal claims of all parties having rights to take water from the said canal. Provided the said parties maintain their rights in court against said city (or that their rights are acknowledged by the proper representatives of said city) by reason of the taking of the water of said Sudbury River; it being understood that in case the city cannot avail itself of the said quantity of water as an offset as above provided for, the said city shall quit-claim to the said Wamesit Power Company its full right and interest in and to said quantity of water."

On Nov. 29 the committee reported to the board "that a settlement had been made with General Butler." On Dec. 2 the papers were signed.

1876.

May 1 the board was called together to organize. The following officers were elected: president, L. Miles Standish; clerk, Walter E. Swan; superintendent Eastern Division, Ezekiel R. Jones; superintendent Western Division, Desmond Fitzgerald.

The president appointed the following committees: Western Division, Messrs. Cutter, Stebbins and Parker; Eastern Division, Messrs. White, Morrison and Standish; Water Registrar's Department, Messrs. Morrison, Parker and Standish; New Supply, Messrs. Standish, Cutter and Powers.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW WATER BOARD WAS NOW UNDER CONSIDERATION.

After the annexation of Charlestown, West Roxbury and Brighton to the city of Boston, Jan. 5, 1874, the subject of uniting the Mystic and Cochituate Water Boards, and reorganizing the entire water department, was brought up in the City Council.

On Feb. 9, 1874, an order was introduced requesting the Joint Standing Committee on Water "to consider and report upon the expediency of providing by ordinance for the establishment of a single board to exercise the powers now vested in the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards, the members of which shall be appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the City Council, and compensated for their services."

On Feb. 20 this order was approved.

On March 9 the committee reported in part, reviewing the ordinances bearing on the matter, and recommending that an act be procured from the Legislature. (See City Document No. 31, 1874.)

We make the following extract from this report:

"During the next few years it will be necessary to spend a very large amount of money in procuring an additional supply of water from some source; and in view of that fact, and also of the increased duties caused by the rapid growth of the city, it is evident that some change is necessary in the present organizations having charge of the water department in order to insure economy and efficiency in the management of its affairs. Those who have been at the head of the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards during a number of years past are unanimous in the opinion that the present system should be changed without delay. It appears, from the opinion of the city solicitor, that it will be necessary to apply to the Legislature for authority to organize the department upon a proper basis; and, without attempting at this time to designate the form of organization which should be adopted, the committee would recommend the passage of the accompanying order requesting the mayor to petition the Legislature for authority to make such changes as the City Council may deem expedient.

For the Committee,

"S. B. STEBBINS, Chairman."

On March 13 an order was approved requesting the mayor to petition for an act in accordance with the above recommendation, and on the sixteenth of the following April the Joint Standing Committee on Water reported that an act had been obtained which, after giving in full, they proceed to say:

"In view of the large expenditures which the city will be obliged to make during the next few years in procuring an additional supply of water, it seems hardly necessary to urge the importance of acting without delay upon the authority granted in this act.

"At a hearing given by the committee on the question of reorganizing the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards, the past and present presidents of those boards were unanimous in the opinion that a reorganization is absolutely necessary.

"Mr. John A. Haven, the president of the Cochituate Water Board, being unable, on account of illness, to attend the meeting, sent the following communication, which may be taken as expressing substantially the views entertained by Hon. Otis Norcross, president of the board in 1865 and 1866; Nathaniel J. Bradlee, Esq., president in 1868, 1869 and 1870, and Charles H. Allen, Esq., president in 1871 and 1872:

" 'Boston, March 7, 1874.

" '*Alderman S. B. Stebbins, Chairman Committee on Water, City Council:*

" 'Dear Sir,—Last evening I received notice of a meeting of the Committee on Water to consider the recent order of inquiry concerning the establishment of a permanent Water Board. Fearing, from continued indisposition, that I should not be able to meet your committee, I have thought it proper to state to you briefly my views of the proposed change.

" 'I am decidedly of the opinion that a permanent, compact and working board of management would far better subserve the interests of the city than the present organization, and this opinion I know is concurred in by many of the past active members of the board, including particularly its past presidents, Messrs. N. J. Bradlee and C. H. Allen, as well as by many prominent city officers, past and present, who have given much attention to the subject. The real work, constituted as is the present Water Board, must of necessity fall upon some two or three of its members, and, if these are actively engaged in business of their own, they cannot easily give that amount of time and attention really required to systematize in detail the large amount of business in the different departments so as to produce the best results. If this difficulty is found while the duty is confined to the present finished or Cochituate system, it is likely to become still greater when the duties of management are so much enlarged by extended territory, by extension of the high service, and by the labors connected with the proposed new supply.

" 'The result of some four years' pretty active experience has led me to the very decided conclusions:

" 'First. That the board should consist of three members only.

" 'Second. Their entire time should be given to the work, for which they should be paid a fair compensation.

“Third. That their term of office should at least embrace the full time required to construct the new work and the settlement of the great number of complicated and delicate questions that must arise from the magnitude of this new work. The numerous contracts for construction, the settlement of land and other damages, and the many other incidental matters require, for successful results, a well-settled and continued business policy.

“While the board is being continually changed in membership—as under the present arrangement—it is impossible to secure that desired system and consequent accountability which business men of largely extended operations would desire to make sure of in their own transactions. The business operations of the Water Board for the next five years will, of necessity, be large and complicated, and its supervision should be regular, continuous and intelligent, to produce the desired results of business success. More particularly is it desirable that the board should be permanent and guided by a well-defined business policy where questions arise between the engineer and the contractors, and where the engineer should, for the best interests of the city, be certain of receiving that support which results from a permanent and continuous policy, in all controverted questions.

“It is very apparent that the present organization of the board is not fitted for the present emergency arising from so large an increase in the business, and I have but little doubt that the Water Committee are fully satisfied that if one reason existed for the appointment of a permanent Fire Commission, many more reasons exist for the appointment of a compact and permanent board to take charge of the rapidly increasing water department, in the completion of which many millions of dollars must be expended within the next few years.

“I have been compelled to give this matter more than ordinary attention, and have briefly, but, I fear, very inadequately, given the result of my reflections; but I think you will find that they agree in the main with those of every one who has heretofore been actively engaged in the management of these works or others of like magnitude.

“Respectfully, your obedient servant,

“JOHN A. HAVEN.”

“To carry out the provisions of the act of the Legislature, the committee have prepared and would recommend the passage of the accompanying ordinance organizing the Boston Water Board and giving it

all the powers heretofore vested in, and exercised by, the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards.

“S. B. STEBBINS,
JOHN T. CLARK,
ALANSON BIGELOW,
FREDERICK PEASE,
EBENEZER ADAMS,
ALONZO WARREN.
WILLIAM H. KENT,
FRANCIS HUNNEWELL,
“Committee.”

The ordinance is not given, as it failed to pass. It will be found in City Document No. 40.

On May 18 a minority report appeared (see City Document No. 54) taking the ground that “appointed commissions are unrepblican and undemocratic.”

This report ends by saying:

“Competent heads of departments, with good committees, will manage the affairs of the city better and cheaper, in our opinion, than commissions will.

“We therefore respectfully report that it is inexpedient to legislate under the present statute.

“FRANCIS A. PETERS,
A. J. HALL.”

The ordinance report submitted by the majority in the meantime had been referred to the Committee on Ordinances, who reported, May 18, a new draft. (See City Document No. 53, 1874.)

The ordinance as reported by this committee was adopted by the Board of Aldermen on June 29 following, but failed in the Common Council by a large vote, after a protracted discussion, “principally (as it is understood) by reason of an alleged defect in the act of the Legislature. There was a question whether, under the terms of the act, the board, when established, would not have authority to take lands and water rights without any further action on the part of the City Council; and as the subject of procuring an additional supply of water from some source was then under consideration, the doubt on that point, as to the powers of the board, was sufficient to cause the rejection of the ordinance.”

The matter was brought before the council early in the year 1875.

On Feb. 20 an order was approved requesting the Committee on Ordinances to report, if they should deem it expedient, an ordinance uniting the two boards.

On March 1 the committee reported in part with an order requesting the mayor to petition for an act giving the Water Board, when established under Chapter 179, Acts 1874, full authority to act as the agents of the city for taking land, etc.

This order passed and was approved by the mayor March 2, 1875.

On March 25, the desired act having been procured, "making it clear that the board cannot act until empowered by the city," the Committee on Ordinances made a report (City Document No. 38, 1875) reviewing some of the facts and recommending the passage of an ordinance to establish the Boston Water Board, to consist of three persons, which was referred to the Joint Standing Committee on Water.

On May 13 the committee reported two ordinances to establish a Water Board (see City Document No. 64, 1875), being a majority and minority report. The following is the majority report:

"In Common Council, May 13, 1875.

"The Joint Standing Committee on Water, to whom were referred the order and ordinance in relation to the reorganization of the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards, having considered the subject, would respectfully recommend the passage of the accompanying ordinance, which provides for the union of the two boards in accordance with the provisions of the act authorizing the annexation of Charlestown to Boston. Under the provisions of the proposed ordinance the new board will consist of nine persons; namely, one member of the Board of Aldermen and two members of the Common Council elected annually by concurrent vote of the City Council; one person (not a member of the City Council) appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the City Council, for a term of three years; and five persons (not members of the City Council) elected by concurrent vote of the City Council, to serve for a period of three years each. The person appointed by the mayor is to be president of the board; devote all his time to the duties of the office, and receive such compensation for his services as the City Council may determine. The other members of the board are to serve without compensation. On the first organization of this board it is necessary to include the number of the present Mystic Water Board whose term of office expires on the first of April, 1876.

"The powers and duties conferred on the new board are the same as those proposed to be conferred on the Boston Water Board.

"Respectfully submitted,

JOHN T. CLARK,
JOHN SWEETZER,
N. S. WILBUR,
HENRY W. WILSON,
EMERY D. LEIGHTON,
P. EDWARDS,

"Committee."

The following is the minority report:

"In Common Council, May 13, 1875.

"The undersigned, members of the Committee on Water, respectfully dissent from the recommendation of the majority in regard to the reorganization of the Cochituate Water Board, and beg leave to state briefly their reasons therefor.

"The proposed ordinance provides that the president of the Water Board shall be appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the City Council, and compensated for his services; and that the eight other members of the board shall be elected by the City Council, to serve without compensation. As the president has no greater power and no greater responsibility than the other members of the board, there is no reason why he should be paid and the others give their services gratuitously. It is a body of equals, and no member, whether paid or unpaid, can divest himself of his responsibility. Being equally responsible, therefore, they must give their time and attention with equal fidelity to the duties of the office; otherwise they cannot act intelligently upon the business with which they have been intrusted. If it is intended that the unpaid members shall be brought together merely for the purpose of registering the decrees of the paid member, then it would be better to leave things where they are now, because we should have a board controlled by one man, who would be burdened with only one-ninth of the responsibility. In a board so constituted there would be neither harmony nor efficiency, and it is not at all probable that we should be able to find suitable men who would be willing to accept any other position than that of president.

"The undersigned are so impressed with the importance of having the great work in which the city is now engaged placed under the supervision

of competent and responsible persons who are paid for their services, that they would be willing, if the authority existed, to recommend that commissioners should be appointed to have special charge of the enlargement of the water works, and to hold office until those works are completed; but it appears, upon examination of the statutes, that the City Council cannot provide for the appointment of a commission to exercise those powers independent of the present Cochituate Water Board.

"The Cochituate and Mystic Boards can be united under the name of the Boston Water Board, as provided by the special act of the Legislature; or they can be kept distinct, and the Cochituate Board can be reorganized so as to consist of three persons appointed by the mayor, with the approval of the City Council, and compensated for their services. Under the present circumstances the undersigned are of opinion that it would be expedient to adopt the latter course; and they would respectfully recommend that the accompanying ordinance providing for a reorganization of the Cochituate Board in the manner suggested be substituted for the ordinance reported by the majority.

"S. B. STEBBINS,
A. O. BIGELOW."

The Common Council adopted the report of the majority, and the Board of Aldermen adopted that of the minority. The matter passed several times between the two branches, and finally, June 28, a Committee of Conference was appointed, who reported, July 19, that they were unable to agree, when the committee was discharged.

On Dec. 16 the Cochituate Water Board passed the following vote, which they transmitted to the mayor:

"Voted, That it is the opinion of this board that the entire water department of this city should be placed in the hands of a commission, who should give their whole time to the duties of the office and be suitably compensated for their services."

Mayor Cobb, in his inaugural address, January, 1876, referred to a new board as follows:

"I urgently recommend that the expenditures on the new work and the management of the whole property, when completed, be committed to a paid commission, who shall be paid for their services, give their whole time to the duties of the office, and be held strictly responsible to the City Council. Becoming thoroughly conversant with the affairs of the department, they would be prepared at all times to answer the ques-

tions and meet the exigencies that are constantly arising, to make contracts and provide supplies on the best terms, and keep a watchful eye on every item of the immense disbursement. Such a service cannot be expected of a board constituted as the present one is. Serving without pay, they can hold only occasional meetings; engaged in their own business, they cannot always be found when wanted, and can only give a divided mind to the city's interests, and but dribblets of their time. Would any sagacious individual or private corporation adopt such a system of management and supervision for a property costing \$17,000,000? The members of the present board are as fully aware as any of us of the unsatisfactory character of the present system, and have communicated to me, in a formal resolve, their opinion that there should be a Water Board constituted as I have recommended. The expense of a paid commission would be utterly insignificant in view of the vast pecuniary interests at stake."

The above portion of the address was referred by the council to the Joint Standing Committee on Water, who reported as follows:

"In Common Council, Feb. 10, 1876.

"The Joint Standing Committee on Water, to whom was referred so much of the mayor's address as relates to the reorganization of the water department, having carefully considered the subject, would respectfully report as follows:

"While some members of the committee are opposed to the radical changes in relation to placing nearly every department of the city government under a paid commission, as proposed by the new charter now under consideration, yet the committee unanimously recognize the fact that the onerous and highly responsible duties which naturally devolve upon the persons who have charge of the water department should be discharged by a paid board who will give their whole time, undivided attention and energy to those duties.

"When the magnitude of the work in connection with the additional supply of water from Sudbury River, involving an expense of nearly five millions of dollars, the number and amounts of the contracts and the very important subject of land and mill damages are considered, your committee submit that there can no longer be a question as to the expediency of immediately placing the water department in strong, responsible and competent hands. The construction of the proposed sewer in the Mystic valley will also prove a large undertaking, and careful and skilful man-

agement will be required for its satisfactory completion. The change which the committee propose meets with the approval of both the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards.

"Without further going into the merits of this question, which has been so fully discussed by the city government of 1874 and 1875, your committee would respectfully recommend the passage of the accompanying ordinance, which provides for the union of the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards under a paid board to consist of three persons, as authorized by Chapter 80 of the acts of the Legislature of 1875.

"The ordinance is substantially the same as that recommended by the Committee on Water on the sixteenth of April, 1874, which was carefully prepared, and which guards and limits the powers vested in the board, and enables the City Council at all times to exercise a wise and careful supervision over their action.

"Certain amendments have been made in the section relating to the receiving of bids and the letting of contracts, in order to conform to the terms and forms of contracts now existing, for the construction of the works now necessary for the introduction of the Sudbury River supply, made by the Cochituate Water Board acting under the authority of the City Council.

"It is provided that the confirmation by the City Council of each member of the Water Board appointed by the mayor shall be decided by vote taken by ballot.

"If the proposed ordinance meets with the approval of the City Council, the powers and duties now exercised by the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards will terminate on the thirtieth of April, the close of the present financial year, except that it is provided that each board shall submit its annual report for the year ending on said date, as required by existing ordinance.

"Respectfully submitted,

"S. B. STEBBINS,
JOHN T. CLARK,
A. O. BIGELOW,
JOHN SWEETSER,
GEORGE A. SHAW,
MARCELLUS DAY,
JOHN W. FRASER,
RICHARD BEECHING,
"Committee on Water."

The ordinance, which is omitted, as it failed to pass, was referred, Feb. 21, to the Committee on Ordinances, with a proposed amendment constituting one alderman, one councilman and three members at large said Water Board.

Finally the Joint Standing Committee on Ordinances reported, Feb. 24, 1876, a new draft of an ordinance (City Document No. 28), which passed both branches of the government and was approved by the mayor March 22, 1876.

On July 6, 1876, the mayor appointed Timothy T. Sawyer, Leonard R. Cutter and Albert Stanwood members of the Boston Water Board for the term of three years, two years and one year, respectively. On July 24 these nominations were confirmed by the City Council, and on July 31 the organization of the Boston Water Board was completed by the choice of Timothy T. Sawyer as chairman and Walter E. Swan as clerk. The last meetings of the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards were held on the same day, and the whole property of the water works transferred to the new board.

From the report on additional supply I quote the following:

"During the past year much progress has been made towards obtaining an additional supply of water from Sudbury River. The conduit from Farm Pond in South Framingham to Chestnut Hill reservoir, about fifteen and three-fourths miles long, was divided into twenty sections, each forming the basis of a contract, and early in May, 1875, the board commenced to advertise for proposals to build the various sections, with the exception of Section No. 1, which was reserved to build by day's labor. Section No. 20, which includes the Beacon Street tunnel, and which was placed under contract in August, 1873, was completed last December, the amount paid the contractors, Messrs. Lobdell & Phelps, being \$336,630.70. Sections 2 to 19, inclusive, were placed under contract at intervals from June 12 to Dec. 30, 1875. The proposals were all publicly opened and read at the office of the board, and in all cases the contracts were awarded to the lowest responsible bidders.

"A table showing the time at which the contracts were executed, the names of the contractors, the range of bids, etc., will be found in the report of the engineer.

"The papers prepared for the seizure of lands on the line of the conduit were signed June 26, and the engineer was authorized to set the stakes and give the contractors for the sections then ready the necessary information to proceed at once with the work.

"The work upon the whole line of the conduit has progressed very



LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE THIRTY-SEVEN.



MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE THIRTY-EIGHT.

favorably, thirty-one per cent of the work on all the sections under contract being done on the first of January, 1876, and the contractors are now fairly under way for another season's work. The time allowed for the completion of the contracts expires Aug. 1, 1877, and from present prospects there is no reason to doubt but that they will all be finished within the required time. By an order of the City Council, approved Oct. 30, 1875, the board was authorized to build Section No. 1 and the foundations of the dams for Basins Nos. 1, 2 and 3 by day's labor, and on Nov. 11 the engineer was authorized to proceed with the work, under the direction of the Committee on New Supply. Section No. 1 crosses the Boston & Albany Railroad at South Framingham. The piles for supporting the tracks over the trench for the conduit have been driven, and considerable progress has been made in constructing the cofferdam for the gatehouse, and the portion of the conduit which extends into Farm Pond.

"Active preparations are also being made to commence work on the foundations of the dams for Basins 1, 2 and 3 at an early day.

"A contract was made Oct. 21, with John Brown of Mohawk, N. Y., for building a road in Framingham, made necessary for the proposed flowing of a portion of the old county road, known as the Worcester turnpike, leading from Framingham to Southboro'. This road is in a fair way to be completed within the time specified in the contract (July 1, 1876).

"In constructing the above road it became necessary to place a bridge across Stony Brook in Framingham. The building of the abutments was included in the contract for the road, and a contract was made Feb. 3, 1876, with Thomas Leighton of Rochester, N. Y., for building and erecting the iron work of the superstructure for the sum of \$1,150. This bridge is now nearly completed.

"On Dec. 30, 1875, the board adopted plans for the seizure of lands for Basins Nos. 1 and 3, and signed the necessary papers for the seizure.

"Owing to the construction of a portion of the conduit in the town of Needham, it became necessary to change the location of Wellesley Avenue in that town. This change was made by the city, and a settlement effected with the town for the sum of \$900 damages and the release of a small strip of land between the old and new locations.

"The Committee on New Supply have devoted much time during the past year to the consideration of damages on the line of the new works. Long and protracted meetings have been held for the purpose of hearing claimants and adjusting claims, and many visits have necessarily been

made to view the premises of the landowners to ascertain the actual amount of damage done. In all cases of settlement the committee has endeavored to obtain the fee of the land. In many cases the demands made appeared so exorbitant to the committee that no settlement could be effected. Notwithstanding the difficulties which the committee has had to contend with, quite a number of important claims have been adjusted.

"On Dec. 30, 1875, a settlement was made with the Wamesit Power Company of Lowell for damages in full by the taking of the water of Sudbury River, for the sum of \$55,000. This amount also includes the retainer for the personal legal services of General B. F. Butler for any and all suits which may be brought against the city on account of the taking of the water of the Sudbury River.

"A number of other claims for water damages have also been made, but the above is the only case that has been settled up to this date.

"On Jan. 13, 1876, the board, on recommendation of General Butler, engaged the services of Linus M. Child as junior counsel in the defence and care of all suits against the city relating to the taking of the water of Sudbury River under the act of the Legislature.

"On March 22, 1876, 'An ordinance to establish the Boston Water Board' was passed by the City Council. This action was in accordance with the views and recommendations of the board, which has felt for some time that the varied and widely extended interests connected with the water works demanded more time and a closer supervision in their administration. The adoption of this ordinance by the City Council practically abolishes the Cochituate Water Board, and this will probably be the last of the annual reports of that organization.

"The first meeting of the Cochituate Water Board was held Jan. 2, 1851, and it is a matter of just pride to the present board, in turning over the works to its successors, to be able to feel in reviewing the twenty-five years that the care of the water works has been entrusted to its keeping, that the city's interests have been guarded, the growing demands of the people promptly met, and the works of maintenance and enlargement executed in a manner to reflect honor upon the city.

"L. MILES STANDISH, President,
LEONARD R. CUTTER,
EDWARD A. WHITE,
CHARLES E. POWERS,
S. B. STEBBINS,
N. M. MORRISON,
AUGUSTUS PARKER."

Naturally a man of such pronounced opinions as my father had made some enemies, especially among the dishonest politicians who were unable to manage him in the least degree. He was appointed on the new Water Board by Mayor Cobb and at first rejected by the Common Council, but finally confirmed by both branches. The accompanying clippings from the daily papers at that time will tell the story:

"Mayor Cobb has earned the gratitude of the citizens of Boston by his recent nominations of men for important positions under the city government. Messrs. Sawyer, Cutter and Stanwood, who have just been confirmed as the members of the new Water Board, are gentlemen having the full confidence of the public. Mr. Cutter has had a long experience in the city government, and his earnest opposition to extravagance, coupled with a faithful and intelligent discharge of his duties, gives assurance that in this new position he will look carefully after the interests of the city."

"BOSTON WATER BOARD.

"The new board to take charge of the supply of water and the water works of this city, assuming all the duties now performed by the present board, will consist of Messrs. T. T. Sawyer, Leonard R. Cutter and Albert Stanwood. Mr. Sawyer was formerly mayor of Charlestown and president of the Mystic Water Board. He has been, since its organization, a member of the Board of Fire Commissioners. Ex-Alderman Cutter has served for five years on the present Water Board, and Mr. Albert Stanwood has been connected with the Cochituate water works for many years. In making these selections Mayor Cobb has been very fortunate. It will prove an able and hard-working board. The nominations were sent to the Common Council last evening."

"The Board of Aldermen yesterday afternoon confirmed the mayor's nominations with only a wry face or two. Some of these nominees will obtain votes in the City Council, from the belief that it is better to permit the 'machine' to run as the outsiders dictate, but this does not seem to be a sufficient reason for sustaining improper selections. When the new Water Board gets under way, an abundant supply of pure water will, it is expected, soon be furnished. That is what the Water Board has been superseded for, and not to provide places in which to put politicians desperately in need of public employment."

"The Board of Aldermen this evening will finish the choice of a Water Board, doubtlessly concurring in the election by the council. There cer-

tainly could be no better or more efficient selection than that which has been made by the other branch of the City Council. Mr. Cutter has proved his capacity by services of no slight value on the board, and his continuance will be gratifying to the public. Mr. Sawyer is president of the Mystic Board, and brings ample experience to the duties of the position. Mr. Stanwood is identified with the Cochituate system, having been connected in responsible administrative positions with the works for about a quarter of a century. Altogether, the new board is one that will give great satisfaction."

The *Boston Traveller*, July 14, says:

"We regret exceedingly that the council, at their meeting last evening, failed to confirm the nomination of Leonard R. Cutter as a member of the new Water Board. Mr. Cutter is practically the ablest one of the three whose nominations were sent in. Mr. Cutter's long experience entitled him to the confirmation, while his business ability would enable him to save the city of Boston nearly or quite half a million dollars in the settlement of the existing claims against the board. With the people, no man stands better or more deservedly higher for those sterling qualities of honesty, integrity, and a faithful discharge of all the duties devolving upon a public official and a servant of the people, than Leonard R. Cutter."

The *Boston Post*, July 14, contained the following:

"The failure of the council to confirm Mr. Leonard R. Cutter as member of the Water Board was a great mistake, which we hope to see corrected on the reconsideration of the vote at the next meeting. It is needless to say that Mr. Cutter is a gentleman of the strictest integrity, of the most absolute and unswerving devotion to the interests of the public trusts which he holds, and of remarkable ability. Every one knows this without being reminded of it. But it should also be understood that Mr. Cutter has actually saved the taxpayers of this city large amounts by his vigilant services, and that it is a measure of practical economy to secure him on the board. Mr. Cutter is a reformer somewhat after the style of Governor Tilden, who puts his ideas into work; and, without doubt, there are some who dislike such a very practical man. But the city cannot do without him."

The *Boston Transcript*, July 15, declares:

"The rejection of Leonard R. Cutter as one of the Water Board, if not reconsidered, deprives the city of the experience and capacity of a gentleman abundantly qualified to render much public service in the

station for which the mayor nominated him. Mr. Cutter was a faithful, zealous and economical alderman for several years, and, by his recent membership upon the Water Board, has become entirely familiar with the duties of such a position. Mr. Cutter is largely endowed with the courage of saying 'no,' which is a virtue not to be despised in an official, and can be relied upon to devote his energy and ability to whatever municipal work he may undertake."

The *Sunday Courier*, July 16, says:

"The failure of the Common Council to confirm the nomination of Leonard R. Cutter as a member of the Water Board is one of those things which nobody, not a politician, can understand. Mr. Cutter is an old and faithful public servant, whose integrity and capability are both unquestioned. He is thoroughly conversant with the needs of the city in all its departments, and he is likewise a recognized friend of economical reform. That his name should have been objected to, while two others not so well known to the general public should have been passed upon favorably and without opposition, is beyond the average comprehension. We trust the action of the council will be reconsidered at the next meeting."

The *Boston Advertiser*, July 19:

"There is to be a special meeting of the council to-morrow evening for the transaction of important unfinished business before the long vacation. The organization of the new Water Board, which should be perfected at once, is delayed by the action of the Common Council in rejecting the nomination of Mr. Cutter at the last meeting. Mr. Cutter has filled many places in the city government with energy, fidelity and ability. That he may have made some enemies in the faithful discharge of his duties is highly probable, but is no disqualification. Under the circumstances, we think the council should reverse its action, both in justice to Mr. Cutter and to the city, which needs the services of the board without unnecessary delay."

The *Boston Journal*, July 19:

"The opposition to Mr. Leonard R. Cutter in the Common Council arises on the part of some of the members from a total misconception of the motives which have given origin to the intrigue against him. Mr. Cutter would make a most valuable member of the new Water Board, and to the fact that he is fearless and honest may be attributed the selfish raid which has been instigated. The city requires the services of men of Mr. Cutter's stamp, and though he has not sought the office, we trust the

Common Council will approve of his nomination as an act of justice and in accordance with the wishes of the citizens of Boston."

As we see by the clipping, there was an opposition to Mr. Cutter's nomination, from the City Council, but notwithstanding this he was chosen and commenced his duties as a member of the Water Board in July, having been elected for two years. The opposition in the council, unwilling to accept the situation, raised, on Sept. 21, a question as to the legality of the election. The following clipping will give an account of the discussion, and the consequent decision of Judge Healy, the city solicitor:

"A QUESTION OF LEGALITY.

"Mr. Taylor of Ward 6 offered an order, That Messrs. — — —, with such of the aldermen as may join, be a committee to inquire and report into the legality of the election of Leonard R. Cutter as a water commissioner.

"Mr. Taylor: My reasons for offering the order are contained in a communication that was sent to the *Boston Herald*, that reads as follows:

" 'A question of parliamentary law has arisen from the recent action of the Common Council in relation to the confirmation of certain commissioners nominated by the mayor, which I deem worthy of public attention. The mayor nominated three gentlemen for commissioners on water, two of whom were confirmed, and the third rejected by a yea and nay ballot. A motion to reconsider the last vote was made, and laid on the table. At a subsequent meeting of the council the motion for reconsideration was taken from the table and passed, and the rejected nominee was declared elected by one vote. Was this a legal action? It is an acknowledged rule of parliamentary law that a vote decided by ballot cannot be again acted upon by one vote to reconsider. In this case was it a ballot or a yea and nay vote? When the yeas and nays are called for, the rule is that the clerk must call the names alphabetically, and each member as his name is called answers yea or nay, and a majority decides. A ballot may be by the use of black and white balls or by a slip of paper having upon it the name of the candidate or the simple words 'yea' or 'nay' written or printed; in either case it is known as a ballot. If no one receives the required number of votes, successive ballots may be had until an election is obtained; but no motion to reconsider a ballot can be or ever has been entertained by either branch of the City Council until in the case now under consideration. General parliamentary laws are binding on all

legislative bodies, unless some special rules are made to the contrary. Neither branch of the City Council has adopted any special rule on this subject, and consequently the general rules are in force. It appears, therefore, that assuming office under the circumstances named does not constitute a legal member of the board. And this fact might be pleaded in any action at law, or in regard to any contract. The legal position of the city in regard to land, water or other damages may thus be compromised, and hence it is important that the question whether or not this election was legal should be determined.'

"That, Mr. President, was a communication which was sent to the *Boston Herald*, and I think that the grounds laid down here ought certainly to be looked into. As I stated, this question may come up in a court of justice at any time. Money may be spent by the water commissioners, who have not been elected. It is a question of law, and I hope the order will pass.

"Mr. Flynn of Ward 13: I hope the order will not pass, and for this reason: If we are to take cognizance of every communication sent to the daily papers, it will keep us in hot water all the time. I move that the order be indefinitely postponed.

"Mr. Taylor: I don't wish to take up the time of the council on a question of this kind; but it is a question of great magnitude, as it seems to me. I don't see why a matter of this kind should be postponed, when some of the ablest legal minds differ in opinion in regard to it. I think that this matter should be properly settled, so that we may understand it; for it will be a benefit to the council to know that what we have done has been done legally. I think it may perhaps save the city of Boston some time, trouble and money in the future.

"Mr. Fox of Ward 13: I wasn't aware that anything of this character was to be introduced into this council to-night; but I sincerely think it would be better for Mr. Cutter, for the city, and for every member of this council, if this matter should be referred to some competent person or committee, with authority to get legal advice upon it. I will say that I voted for Mr. Cutter, although I am not a particular friend of his; but if I were, I should certainly say, Have this matter referred to a committee, that some inquiry may be made whether he was legally elected or not as a member of the Board of Water Commissioners. My first reason would be this: any enemy of Mr. Cutter could apply to the Supreme Court, and perhaps have granted an *ex parte* injunction enjoining the city from paying Mr. Cutter one dollar for his services, and the legality of his election

could be contested. Now, to avoid anything of that kind, to avoid any such question as to the legality of his election, I think the matter should be settled. Any evil-disposed person could apply for an injunction of this kind, and the city could be enjoined from paying him a single cent of his salary. In order to avoid any unpleasantness of that kind, I sincerely hope that this matter may be referred to somebody, in order to ascertain whether Mr. Cutter has been legally elected.

“Mr. Sweetser: I would move that the order be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to get the opinion of the city solicitor upon the subject. I move that as a substitute.

“Mr. Flynn: I hope no such reference will be made until somebody raises the question of the legality of Mr. Cutter’s election. It hasn’t been raised here yet. The gentleman only quoted from a newspaper paragraph. Until somebody questions the legality of Mr. Cutter’s election, I hope that the council will not stultify itself by asking that this be referred to a committee. Therefore I move the indefinite postponement of the whole subject. If the question does come up, let it come in the way suggested by the gentleman from Ward 13, by some of the citizens.

“The President: The question must first be taken upon the motion to amend.

“Mr. Sweetser: Do I understand that it is to call in question the legality of the election of Mr. Cutter?

“Mr. Taylor: I would state that at no time have I considered Mr. Cutter legally elected, and I would be willing to test it. I would accept the amendment of the gentleman that it be referred to the city solicitor and others.

“Mr. Fox: Has the gentleman from Ward 6 obtained legal advice upon this matter?

“Mr. Taylor: I have, sir.

“Mr. Shaw of Ward 12: I should hope that no such summary process as the indefinite postponement of this great question will be allowed here. It is a mooted question. The highest legal authority in this city—men profound in the law—differ in regard to it. It is a mooted question whether this election is legal, and whether it will stand in the courts as a legal election. The gentleman from South Boston, Mr. Fox—I forget his ward—has stated that it is subject to an appeal to the Supreme Court. Ten citizens can at any time apply to the Supreme Court for an injunction, and they would get a temporary injunction under which the whole matter would be heard. Now, sir, this question has been mooted from the day



LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE FORTY-FIVE.

of that election, and there are various opinions upon the subject; and I think with the gentleman from South Boston that it should be settled. I voted for the reconsideration, but I did not believe that a ballot could be reconsidered legally. I think it ought not to be permitted without most thorough investigation. I think I should be willing to accede to my friend's amendment [Mr. Sweetser] that the Judiciary Committee might consider it, with such legal authority as they shall see fit to employ to aid them. I would not be willing to leave it entirely to the city solicitor alone. The city solicitor's opinion is almost in all cases made to coincide with the votes of the council. I wouldn't detract anything from his power or authority in the premises; but he isn't immaculate. Many times his decisions have been overruled. What was his decision in the Whitcomb case? His decision was overruled. The Legislature never had any constitutional right to pass any such bill as they passed, and the Supreme Court ordered it to be stricken from the statutes. I think this question should be considered which the gentleman has brought before the council; and I hope it will be considered by the proper committee, with such advice as they may deem best to get.

"The President: Does the gentleman offer that as an amendment?

"Mr. Shaw: I do; that the Judiciary Committee be authorized to employ such legal services as they may see fit.

"Mr. Taylor: I would be willing to accept those amendments—

"Mr. Flynn: I object.

"Mr. Adams of Ward 5: I have myself felt—

"Mr. Shaw: Do I understand the gentleman from Ward 13 to object to the amendment to the amendment?

"Mr. Flynn: I object to his accepting the amendment.

"Mr. Shaw: My amendment is in order.

"The President: It is.

"Mr. Adams: I hope the amendment will meet the approval of the council, for it has been a question in my own mind since the facts were brought out as to the legality of that election, and I never have been satisfied. Supposing that advice had been taken upon the question, I had not given much thought to it. But I had supposed that, previous to the reconsideration, the propriety of such a motion had been considered at the time, and whether or not it was legal. It seems to me now that as this subject has been called in question, it should be thoroughly investigated, so that we might know our position, especially so as it has been brought before us by the gentleman from Ward 6.

"The President: The question is upon the amendment of Mr. Shaw, and such other legal authority as they may deem expedient.

"Mr. Flynn: I hope that amendment will not prevail, for the reason that we have already in the employ of the city some five or six solicitors; and to give this committee authority to go outside and employ such counsel as they may deem expedient is, I think, giving them too much authority.

"Mr. Taylor: I don't know why the gentleman from Ward 13 is so tenacious in a matter of this kind. We only want to do right. If the committee deem the city solicitor sufficient authority, that will be sufficient. Many times the city solicitor has given a verbal opinion upon matters of perhaps not such importance as this; but the next day he has contradicted that opinion and given altogether a different one. I hope it will be settled properly.

"Mr. Flynn: I am tenacious about it from the fact that when I find a man hounding and following Mr. Cutter as the gentleman from Ward 6 has continued to do, I deem it my duty to uphold him so far as I can in my position. I know that the gentleman from Ward 6 has followed this man for the last four or five years, particularly at the last election, when he was up for the position of water commissioner, and I deem it my duty now to uphold the character of that man.

"Mr. Taylor: I haven't questioned the character of this man, and when the gentleman says I have hounded this man, he is uttering a falsehood.

"The President: The gentleman is out of order.

"Mr. Taylor: I would like to have him know it. I have never hounded this man, and never said one word against him. This question should be decided for the benefit of the city. If the gentleman is a friend of Mr. Cutter, he should want to have it decided for his sake. I am not opposed to his having the office of water commissioner; but I want him legally elected.

"On motion of Mr. Parker the main question was ordered.

"Mr. Shaw's amendment was adopted, thirty for, eighteen against, and the amendment of Mr. H. Sweetser (as thus amended) was adopted. The order as amended was then read a second time and put upon its passage.

"A motion to lay on the table by Mr. Flynn was declared lost.

"Mr. Flynn doubted the vote, and called for the yeas and nays, which were ordered—ten for, thirty-one against.

"The motion to table was lost—yeas sixteen, nays thirty-three:

"Yeas: Messrs. Blodgett, Daniel Doherty, Flynn, Fraser, Gray, Guild, Hall, Jaques, Lappen, Morrison, O'Donnell, Otis H. Pierce, Richard Pope, Sampson, Spenceley, Ticknor—sixteen.

"Nays: Messrs. Adams, Barr, Beeching, Blanchard, Burgess, Burke, Davis, Devereux, Felt, Firth, Fox, Ham, Howes, Kelley, Kingsbury, Morrill, Newton, Parker, Benjamin Pope, Reed, Robbins, Shaw, Shay, Sprague, Stone, Sweetser, Albert H. Taylor, William Taylor, Train, Tuttle, Walbridge, Webster, Woodbury—thirty-three.

"Absent or not voting: Messrs. Clarke, Crocker, Curtis, Cushing, Day, Joseph Doherty, Gragg, Graham, Loring, May, Mullen, Osborne, Peabody, Pearl, J. H. Pierce, Rice, Ruffin, Shepard, Sibley, Smardon, Trull, Willcutt.

"Mr. Flynn moved to specially assign further consideration of the order to next Thursday evening at 9 o'clock.

"Mr. Jaques: I hope that motion will prevail. I have no objection to an inquiry being made in this case in a proper way; but it seems to me, from the manner in which this order is introduced, and the course which has been taken through the amendments offered to it, that it is doing what is not very dignified for the council to do, and that is not the best way to approach the matter. If any inquiry is to be made at all, it should be through our law department, employed for that special purpose; and that insults against those officers should not be made here. If there are doubts as to this case, we should first get the opinion of our law officers; and if the council is not satisfied with that opinion, it will then be proper to get other advice. But I think it should first be referred to the law department, and therefore I oppose the passage of the order.

"Mr. Guild of Ward 9: I certainly hope this motion to assign will prevail. Here we have elected a gentleman who some of us may have very good reason to consider competent to fill the position, and who some of us are not satisfied should receive what may be construed as an insult. It may be possible that this council have made mistakes in their parliamentary proceedings; if so, any reasonable gentleman is ready to undo them. But we should undo them in a dignified and proper manner, and certainly see that we put no insult upon a gentleman whom we have asked to accept office, and who we have reason to expect has been legally elected. The line the discussion has taken to-night has convinced me that we should give ourselves time to calmly consider the matter. A week's delay will do not harm. I regret to hear it said that the city solicitor's

opinions are made to correspond with the votes of this council. We all know that such expression is but loose talk. I think we have a city solicitor that the majority of the people of Boston believe tries to do his duty irrespective of the votes of this council. If he does not, let us induce our successors to remove him and put a more just and high-minded man in the position. Now it is treating a man discourteously to start off-hand, as it were, upon the authority of a mere newspaper paragraph and inquire into the legality of his election. I don't know that anything further can be said upon this question, except to say that the deliberative way is a thoroughly fair manner to treat it; and I think that every reasonable man will agree with me that we shall act coolly and calmly if we consent to the assignment as moved by the gentleman from Ward 13.

"Mr. Sweetser: I think this matter of so much importance that it should be settled by competent authority; and it was for that reason I offered the amendment I did, to refer it to the city solicitor. I voted against the amendment to the amendment, because I thought it very disrespectful to the city solicitor. I moved to strike out that part of the order [as amended] authorizing the employment of other authority.

"The President: The motion to assign is in order.

"Mr. Firth of Ward 16: If there appeared to be any insult to any person, in passing the resolution now before the council, I should certainly not vote for it, for it never entered into my mind that such a question should come up. I voted for Mr. Cutter at the time of his election, and therefore I am not actuated by any hostility to him. But the question is raised by a member of this council as to the legality of Mr. Cutter's election, and the gentleman informs us that he has taken legal advice upon it; and I take it that it is a very simple and fair thing to refer it to a regular committee of this council, and get its opinion upon the question. When you get beyond that and say who that committee shall take counsel of, there may be room for a difference of opinion. I understand that the Judiciary Committee are not bound by our action in this matter. They will consider it and take the advice of the city solicitor; but if this regularly constituted committee of this body are not satisfied, and desire to know the opinion of anybody beside the city solicitor, why should not they be permitted by us to have that right? Who has a right to feel insulted or wronged? Certainly not Mr. Cutter. We as the City Council may authorize a committee to do it, and they may get any counsel they think fit. That is all the resolution amounts to.

"Mr. Jaques: I trust the gentleman will withdraw the motion to specially assign.

“Mr. Flynn: I withdraw it.

“Mr. Jaques: I renew the motion to strike out that portion relating to asking other advice besides the city solicitor; and I believe that then the order can be passed nearly, if not quite, unanimously. I also believe the result can be arrived at quite as well under that order as it can as the order now stands. The gentleman who just sat down says he is not aware of any reflections upon the city solicitor by the wording of the order. But he must consider that the gentleman who offered the amendment, and other gentlemen who supported it, declared in the most unmistakable language their want of confidence in that department. Those remarks go upon record with the order, and therefore it is due to the law department and to us that we take that part of it back. It is unnecessary and will do no sort of good. I dislike to see irresponsible men stand up and insult and reflect upon officers whom they personally do not like, or whose opinions have been given contrary to their notions of things. This body is not made up of legal gentlemen. I, for one, do not pretend to have an opinion that I would place beside that of the city solicitor, and say whether he is right or wrong. We shall take an improper course if this order goes upon record as it now stands.

“Mr. Train: I hardly see the necessity for that amendment, and I hope it will not prevail. I think the gentleman has taken upon himself an unnecessary defence. I voted for the last amendment, without detracting from the city solicitor. At the same time, this is an important question, and if it is to be decided, the Judiciary Committee should not have their hands tied. If it is desired to cover up anything, why, then it may be well to tie them up. I don't know but the city solicitor will give the necessary opinion, and they need go no further; but I don't believe in strictly confining them to that authority. I don't believe any gentleman here intends to insult any one. As to the authority from which this comes, I don't think there is any man here but who is the peer of the others.

“Mr. Shaw: The only undue reflection cast this evening is by the gentleman himself [Mr. Jaques] upon every member of this board. He charges his colleagues with having reasons known only to themselves with regard to this matter, and then talks of the irresponsibility of the gentleman who offered this order. We are the peers of each other, men, and every one of us has an opinion of his own; and whether it is as good an opinion as that of the city solicitor is yet to be proven. Now, sir, when he charges this council with being undignified, I say he does him-

self injustice, as well as his associates. Is it undignified to do right? Is it undignified to ask from the proper authorities an opinion upon a mooted question—one of the most important that can be brought before this city government? If we have made a mistake, let us try to correct it. I voted for Mr. Cutter and for the reconsideration. I am the peer of every gentleman here, as he [Mr. Jaques] is, and I am not to be told that any member upon this floor is irresponsible, and isn't to offer any suggestion of this kind. I presume that the object of the order is to try to do justice. Let us see whether we have established a bad precedent or a good one. I undertake to say there isn't such a precedent in the history of this city government. It was never done before; a ballot never was reconsidered before. Give us a chance to learn from sound lawyers and the judges of the courts whether or not this is good ground to stand upon. I am upon the Water Committee, and I think Mr. Cutter is a good man for the position. I expect to have something to do with the Water Board, and I want to know whether ten citizens have cause to go to the Supreme Court and ask for an injunction.

"Mr. Jaques: The gentleman has totally misapprehended and misinterpreted what I said in regard to the irresponsibility of the gentleman offering the order, and my motive for wishing the amendment defeated. I mean that the gentleman is irresponsible in this sense: that we have a law department established for a particular purpose of having doubtful questions of law presented to it, and when a gentleman stands up, with no pretence or claim, as I understand it, to legal knowledge, and tells us in effect and in words, and he reflects very severely upon the city solicitor, by saying in effect that the city solicitor is incompetent to decide this question, I say it is going further than this council is willing to go. That is the whole question. So far as the gentleman is a guide to us, he is, in that sense, irresponsible. I do not intend, so far as my vote goes, to offer an insult to our officers. The gentleman says nothing is reflected upon the city solicitor by the wording of the amendment; but I must repeat that it was the words accompanying the offering and support of that amendment which make the insult.

"Mr. Taylor: I want all to understand that I didn't offer this order to insult anybody. All I ask is to have the opinion of men who know. I was willing to accept the amendments of Mr. Sweetser and the gentleman from Ward 12. It is a well-known fact that the city solicitor has given verbal opinions and afterward changed them in writing. I intended no insult, but to have this question settled satisfactorily.

"Mr. Howes: I don't want to be brought into an imaginary contest with the law by voting against the proposed change, for I think no one has a higher opinion of the law officers than I have. My idea is that the Judiciary Committee will have to take counsel of experts in parliamentary law.

"Mr. Fox: I suppose the Judiciary Committee will get other counsel and report; but we are to be controlled not by the opinion of A, B and C, but by that of the city solicitor; and if in his opinion Mr. Cutter is properly elected, then the whole question is settled. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

"Mr. Shaw: I wish to set myself right. I don't wish to be misquoted by gentlemen as saying that the city solicitor is not competent. I never said any such thing, nor intimated it. I did say there were various opinions upon this question, as every gentleman knows there are upon all important questions. The amendment leaves it to the discretion of the committee to employ such counsel as they see fit. The gentleman from Ward 13 says we are bound by the city solicitor's opinion. I ask if we are bound by anybody's opinion. Who intimates that we are bound by the city solicitor's opinion? Who ever heard of such a thing? We have a right to vote yes or not.

"Mr. Flynn: What do we employ the city solicitor for?

"Mr. Shaw: To do the business of the city.

"Mr. Flynn: Exactly.

"Mr. Shaw: The gentleman ought to know that, for he has felt the effect of it.

"Mr. Guild: What kind of business?

"Mr. Shaw: Well, Mr. Guild ought to know what.

"Mr. Guild: I call the gentleman to order.

"Mr. Shaw: Well, go on with your points of order.

"The President: The gentleman from Ward 9 will state his point of order.

"Mr. Guild: My point is, sir, that the gentleman is out of order in calling a member's name in debate.

"The President: The point is well taken.

"Mr. Shaw: I hope the gentleman, then [Mr. Guild], will rise when he addresses the chair.

"Mr. Guild: I appeal to the gentlemen all around me in confirmation of the fact. I did rise. The gentleman [Mr. Shaw] is mistaken.

"Mr. Shaw: Well, then, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

"Mr. Guild: A mistake promptly acknowledged shall be as promptly forgotten. I beg the gentleman will go on.

"Mr. Shaw: I don't wish to make any issue. But, as I said, lawyers as profound and astute as Mr. Healy differ. I only want to get at the facts.

"On motion of Mr. Sampson, the main question was ordered.

"Mr. Jaques's amendment prevailed, and the order as amended was passed.

"Adjourned, on motion of Mr. Flynn."

"THE LEGALITY OF MR. CUTTER'S ELECTION.

"Mr. Pierce of Ward 18 submitted the following:

"The Committee on the Judiciary respectfully report that in accordance with the order of the Common Council, they have obtained the opinion of the city solicitor as to the legality of the election of Leonard R. Cutter as water commissioner, and herewith submit the same:

"City Solicitor's Office, 2 Pemberton Square,

Boston, Sept. 28, 1876.

"Gentlemen: I have received and considered the question proposed to me by you in accordance with the order of the Common Council passed the twenty-first inst., which is in substance, Is Leonard R. Cutter legally a member of the Boston Water Board? The doubt whether Mr. Cutter legally holds his place in the Water Board arises wholly, as I understand, from the suggested irregularity of the action of the Common Council upon the question of the confirmation of Mr. Cutter's nomination when it was submitted to that body by His Honor the mayor. That action, as appears from the record, was as follows:

"The question upon the confirmation of the nomination was taken by ballot, those voting in the affirmative writing upon their ballots the word yea, and those voting in the negative writing the word nay. The larger number of ballots was against the confirmation, and the nomination was thus rejected. Subsequently the council reconsidered the vote rejecting the nomination, and by ballot in like manner confirmed it.

"The objection to these proceedings of the council is thus stated: Elections by ballot cannot be reconsidered; Mr. Cutter was rejected by a vote taken by ballot; this action was final, and could not afterward be abrogated or changed.

"The objection assumes that the council in acting upon Mr. Cutter's



MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE FORTY-SIX.

nomination was electing a member of the Water Board, which, in my judgment, was not the case. The council could make no choice between different candidates; it could only confirm or reject the nomination made by the mayor; and when it had rejected the nomination it could not substitute or even propose another name in the place of Mr. Cutter. The proceeding of the council then was not an election. The mode of voting adopted makes the action no more irrevocable than it would have been if the vote had been taken *viva voce* , or in any other form by which the sense of the council might have been ascertained.

"In my opinion, therefore, Mr. Cutter is legally a member of the Boston Water Board.

"I am, very respectfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"JOHN P. HEALY.

"To the Judiciary Committee of the Common Council.

"The report was accepted."

On the thirty-first of July, 1876, the board held its first meeting, and was organized by the choice of Timothy T. Sawyer as chairman; and official notice thereof, as required by the ordinance, was sent by him to the Cochituate and Mystic Water Boards, which boards ceased to exist after having formally transferred to this board the documents and property in their possession and then under their care and custody. At the first meeting of the board, Mr. Walter E. Swan was elected clerk, and sworn to the faithful performance of the duties of that office.

The first business of the board was to make a careful personal examination of the property placed under their charge; and to this end, in company with the city engineer and the superintendents of divisions, they made visits all along the line of the new Sudbury River, the Cochituate and Mystic water works, and to all the reservoirs, pumping-stations, shops, yards and places connected with the water works of the city, and occupied and used in carrying on the business of the water department. The general condition of what they saw was such as seemed to warrant the decision of the board to make only such changes as careful study and observation might prove to be necessary.

The board being authorized to establish and regulate the prices and rents for the use of water, deemed it proper at once to establish and continue the old rates, as very careful comparisons and calculations would be necessary in determining on modifications and changes which at a later period they might be expected to make.

Immediately after entering upon their duties, the board were pressed with claims from persons whose lands and estates had been taken and disturbed by the construction of the Sudbury River works, and a great deal of time was taken up in examining the estates, hearing the parties, and estimating the amount of damages; and but a month had elapsed after the organization, when the commissioners appointed by the Superior Court to estimate the damage to mill owners and others occasioned by the taking by the city of Boston of the water of Sudbury River and its tributaries, commenced their investigations. The greater part of the time for more than two months was occupied by them in viewing the premises of the claimants, hearing evidence and the arguments of counsel. The defence and care of all suits against the city relating to the taking of the water of Sudbury River had been intrusted by the Cochituate Water Board to General B. F. Butler, assisted by Linus M. Child, Esq., as counsel for the city, and all the cases before these commissioners were under their management; but the magnitude and importance of the cases were such as to especially interest the board and occupy the greater part of their thought and time. The petitions, testimony and arguments of counsel in these cases make a printed volume of nearly twelve hundred pages.

It will be seen, from what has been said, that in addition to the ordinary care and management of the water department, the board entered upon their duties with a large amount of unusual and important work on their hands; and that, for a while at least, watchful attention to this work, which had been laid out by others, would be all that they could reasonably expect to accomplish; nevertheless, they have not forgotten that a reorganization of the department, a modification of the water rates and an improved condition generally of things placed under their charge will, in a reasonable time, be expected and required of them by the City Council.

The board have under their charge and direction the Cochituate, the Mystic and the Sudbury River water works.

The report at this time on the quality of the water is interesting on account of the trouble which arose on that subject later.

The water from Cochituate Lake during the past year has been of good quality, and no complaints of it have been heard from any quarter. The unaccountable cucumber taste, which for a while shut out of use the Bradlee basin of Chestnut Hill reservoir, to which it was confined, has unaccountably disappeared, and since the gate was opened on the first of

April, 1876, the basin has been in use, and the quality of the water unexceptionable.

The mingling of the Sudbury River water with that of Lake Cochituate has had no unfavorable effect on its quality, and there is every reason to believe that the quality of the Sudbury River water, when the works are completed, will be entirely satisfactory. Weekly examinations of the quality of the water as delivered in the city have been made by Professor Nichols of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A vast amount of work came upon this board, owing to the seizure of land necessary to construct the new supply. "The settlement of claims growing out of these takings has occupied much the largest portion of the time of the board, and will continue to do so for some time to come. Indeed, the difficulties attending these settlements can hardly be realized except by those who have had similar duties to perform. The board understand fully, they think, the provisions in the act authorizing the taking of lands, which makes the city liable to pay all damage that shall be sustained by any persons in their property by such taking; and they have acted upon the ground that the city not only expected but was desirous of making full compensation for the injury sustained by individuals in the construction of a necessary public work.

"They have met the claimants in this spirit, not to drive sharp bargains with them, but to form a fair judgment, after careful examination and consideration, of the actual damage done, and to make awards to cover it. It has been extremely difficult to estimate the damage done to some of the more valuable estates through which the conduit has been built, or from which land has been taken, and in some of these cases there is a wide difference between the amounts claimed and the offers of the board. But this fact alone, with the experience of the board in the settlement of other cases, is not discouraging, and they are hopeful that litigation will be avoided with most of the claims. But few have as yet been entered in court, and commissioners have been appointed but for three. Seventy-eight claims have been settled, amounting in the aggregate to \$270,520.10."

BOSTON WATER BOARD, ORGANIZED JULY 31, 1876.

The department for the year from 1876 to 1877 was organized as follows: Timothy T. Sawyer, chairman, until the first Monday of May, 1879; Leonard R. Cutter, until the first Monday of May, 1878; Albert Stanwood, until the first Monday of May, 1877; clerk, Walter E. Swan;

superintendent of the Eastern Division of Cochituate Department, Ezekiel R. Jones; superintendent of the Western Division of Cochituate Department, Desmond Fitzgerald; superintendent of Mystic Department, Charles H. Bigelow; water registrar of the Cochituate Department, William F. Davis; water registrar and clerk of the Mystic Department, Joseph H. Caldwell; engineer, Joseph P. Davis; resident engineer of Additional Supply, A. Fteley.

The second annual report of the Boston Water Board contains the following:

"The greater part of the time of the board during the year has been taken up with the consideration and settlement of claims for property taken under the act authorizing the city to obtain an additional supply of pure water, and in carrying out the orders of the City Council for the construction of the works authorized by said act.

"The building of the Mystic Valley sewer, with the negotiations necessary to determine its line, and the settlement of damages, has also taken much time, and this, with the ordinary care of the Cochituate and Mystic works, has left but small opportunity for the study and consideration of changes which, in their first annual report, the board expressed an opinion were desirable and needful in the water department; nevertheless, some progress has been made in this direction, and the work of reorganization is kept constantly in mind, and will gradually be accomplished.

"No changes have been made during the year in the prices and rents for the use of water. A good deal of information bearing upon the subject has been obtained, and how to equalize and modify the present regulations is the study of the board. The matter is beset with difficulties which cannot easily be overcome; but when the new works are complete and a full supply of water made unquestionable, an improved tariff of water rates will at least be possible.

"The board have not felt warranted in making a further reduction in the price for water supplied by meter, until the effect of the reduced valuation of real estate, and the general depression in business, upon the income from the sales of water could be ascertained."

In 1878 Mr. Cutter's term of two years expired, and he was renominated by the Republican mayor, Henry L. Pierce, for a term of three years.

The nomination was rejected in each branch of the government, but was afterward reconsidered in each branch, and was finally confirmed.

The following clippings are from the papers relating to it:

"The Board of Aldermen had a short session yesterday. An order was introduced from the Finance Committee for borrowing \$600,000 on account of the introduction of Sudbury River water. Mr. David Chamberlin was nominated by the mayor as a member of the Board of Fire Commissioners for three years, and confirmed; and so was the nomination of Charles H. Allen to the same board. But Mr. Leonard R. Cutter, designated by the mayor as a member of the Water Board, failed of confirmation, receiving only four votes, while six aldermen voted against him. The *Post* says: 'There is no possible reason for rejecting him, except the one circumstance which proves all powerful with this "non-partisan" government—he is a Democrat. On this line the city government takes its stand, definitely and inevitably.' The mayor, it appears, did not hesitate to select Mr. Cutter, although he is a Democrat. The executive constitutes one branch of the city government. Mr. Cutter was not rejected by the board for his politics. That idea had no influence upon the decision. His strongest aldermanic opponent was a Democrat, and the board divided in his case upon other than partisan considerations. The board again elected Sylvanus Smith a director of the East Boston ferries—thus adhering to its admirable choice at the outset."

"Leonard R. Cutter was rejected by the Board of Aldermen on Monday as a Water Board commissioner, solely because he is a Democrat. The programme at City Hall is that no Democrat can obtain or hold office under the present régime."

"WATER COMMISSIONER.

"An executive communication came down nominating Leonard R. Cutter for member of the Boston Water Board for three years, and the question on confirmation was taken, in accordance with the statute, by a yea and nay ballot.

"Committee: Messrs. Wolcott of Ward 2, Perham of Ward 23, and Cox of Ward 15.

"Whole number of votes, sixty-four; necessary for a choice, thirty-three; yes, twenty-six; no, thirty-eight.

"The nomination was rejected in non-concurrence."

"THE WATER COMMISSIONER.

"Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16 moved a reconsideration of the vote by which the nomination of Leonard R. Cutter as a member of the Water

Board was rejected. Mr. Rosnosky advocated the motion, believing the council at its previous meeting had done Mr. Cutter a gross injustice.

"Mr. Spenceley of Ward 19 advocated the motion and replied to some of the objections urged by Alderman Stebbins against the nomination. He read from a speech of the alderman in 1875, in which he said if Mr. Cutter would accept the position he would vote for him.

"The motion to reconsider was carried—yeas forty-one, nays twenty-one—as follows:

"Yeas: Messrs. Barry, Brawley, Brintnall B., Brintnall N. Y., Cannon, Colby, Cox, Crocker, Day, Devlin, Doherty, Drynan, Flynn, Howland, Lauten, McDonald, McGahey, McGaragle, McGeough, Mullane, Mullen, Pearl, Perham, Plimpton, Richardson M. W., Roach, Rosnosky, Rust, Sampson E. H., Santry, Shepard, Sibley, Spenceley, Taylor J. F., Taylor J., Thompson, Toppan, Ward, Webster, Whicher, Wilson—forty-one.

"Nays: Messrs. Barnard, Burke, Clapp, Coe, Denny, Fernald, Ham, Hibbard, Hill, Kendrick, Lovering, Mowry, Nason, Pierce J. H., Richardson J. B., Sampson O. H., Sawyer H. N., Sawyer N., Thorndike, Wheeler, Wyman—twenty-one.

"Mr. Thompson of Ward 9 moved to specially assign the matter to the next meeting. Lost.

"A yea and nay ballot was then taken, with the following result: For confirmation, thirty-six; against, twenty-seven; blank, one. And Mr. Cutter was confirmed."

"The confirmation of Leonard R. Cutter for membership in the Water Board will come before the aldermen again Monday, on a motion by Alderman Viles to reconsider the vote of rejection. There is no surety that the vote of the aldermen will be changed."

"We hope the Democrats in the Common Council this evening will vote solidly to confirm Water Commissioner Cutter's nomination. Mr. Cutter is a capable and efficient officer and a good Democrat—and Democratic nominations are none too frequent under this 'non-partisan' administration."

"The Common Council last evening did a sensible thing in reconsidering the vote of the previous meeting, by which the nomination of Mr. Cutter as a member of the Water Board was rejected. Immediately thereafter the nomination was confirmed."

"The mayor's message, appointing Leonard R. Cutter a member of

the Boston Water Board for three years, was taken up, when Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12 moved to lay the nomination on the table, and stated that he wished the Committee on Ordinances to amend the ordinance relating to water, so that members of the Water Board shall hold office for three years, or until their successors are appointed. Mr. Whitmore declared that there was a general feeling that the Water Board had been remiss or incompetent, because of the impurities in the water supply. Large amounts of the city's money had been expended by the Water Board, but the water was in a very bad condition. This state of things had been endured long enough, and some remedy was demanded. A rambling discussion then ensued concerning the legality of an appointment for three years, and kindred matters. Things got so mixed that the motion to table was withdrawn, and the council then confirmed Mr. Cutter by a vote of forty-two to thirteen."

"The rejection by the aldermen of a nomination made Monday by the mayor is an event which must call for explanation. The facts in the case, as we understand them, are these: Mr. Leonard R. Cutter is a respected citizen of Boston. He has held various local offices, and, being chairman of the Board of Aldermen at the time that Mayor Pierce was compelled to leave to assume his Congressional duties, Mr. Cutter became acting mayor. Against his integrity, as against his capacity, not a word has been spoken. In fact, the chief complaint made about him is that he is too faithful a servant of the city. For some seven years Mr. Cutter has been a member of the Water Board. The gentlemen who have been associated with him recognize his abilities, and respect his usefulness. He has served the city well. But Monday, Mayor Pierce, pursuing the non-partisan policy which we have a right to expect from him, nominated Mr. Cutter for a new term. He was rejected, but, we are glad to say, the vote was not a partisan vote. Two of the six negative votes were Democrats, the others Republican. Thus the matter stands. So far as we can learn, there are four reasons given for this action: First, an inharmonious state in the Water Board, and this, we feel authorized to say, does not exist except in imagination; second, the grievances of certain citizens who have had dealings with the board; third, the straightforward, businesslike, perhaps brusque, manner of the gentleman in question; fourth, the personal grievance of a Democratic alderman. The ordinary reader will be apt to say that we have named no sufficient reason for the rejection. That is what we think. To be sure, there are men who have heretofore held high positions in the city government who aspire to suc-

ceed Mr. Cutter. It cannot be that their influence has prevailed upon the Board of Aldermen. We certainly would not make such an accusation. Some of these gentlemen we know are Democrats. Perhaps all are. It is not necessary now to go into that matter. But here are the facts. A man who has served the city long and faithfully, against whose integrity and capacity not a word is breathed, is nominated by Mayor Pierce for another term. The aldermen see fit to reject the nomination. Now, what excuse will they give to their constituents if they succeed in depriving the city of the services of such a man?"

"A STATEMENT FROM MR. LEONARD R. CUTTER.

"To the Editor of the Transcript:

"I hope you will allow me the necessary space in your paper to deny several false assertions that were made at the last meeting of the Board of Aldermen, the full report of which appeared in your issue of yesterday afternoon—especially as you have taken occasion to emphasize their import by the following editorial language:

"'The debate which occurred on the subject will attract public attention, as showing the strong grounds upon which Mr. Cutter's confirmation was opposed.'

"It is true that public attention is called to a series of as cleverly distorted facts as it has been my fortune to read for a long time. My official position gives me no opportunity to meet these statements as I should like, by a full oral denial, and I am compelled to resort to this method of meeting my accusers fully and squarely as I propose to do.

"The points made by Alderman McLean, when sifted of repetition, weak statements and profuse expressions of personal affection and friendship, may be summed up under two heads, as follows: First, I was guilty of opposing the introduction of self-closing faucets; second, I opposed the licensing of plumbers.

"Under the first head, the gentleman tries to make it appear that because I was the possessor of some tenement houses in the city of Boston, I allowed my private interests to conflict with the interests of the citizens. Now I will not allow myself to be behind the gentleman himself in my regard for the interests of the city, and I challenge him to produce from the records of the Water Board, or any other board with which I have had the honor to be connected, any evidence to prove to the contrary.

"The question of introducing self-closing faucets throughout the city

I believe to be a measure uncalled for, and it was a question on which there was much discussion at the time, and a point on which the best of citizens differed.

"It is true that we were forcing a large amount of water through the aqueduct, but the gentleman failed to state our true difficulty correctly. The trouble really was that the drainage area of the lake was exhausted. We did not have the water at the fountain-head in sufficient quantities to meet the demand.

"The opposition I made at the time, and which the alderman has so magnified, was made in the interests of the great mass of citizens, and against obliging them to change all their fixtures.

"As a matter of fact, the rule which the board finally adopted, and which I cheerfully carried out in my own houses, as far as it applied, only covered three of my 'thirty' tenement houses. It is true, as stated, that I called on the gentleman recently to ascertain the real facts governing his opposition to me in the Board of Aldermen, never having received from him before any intimations of what he terms selfishness or dereliction in official duty. His conversion has been both recent and sudden. What shall we think of a man who is obliged to resort to revelations of personal interviews as arguments to sustain his cause? For myself, I have no sympathy for that mock friendship which in one and the same breath proclaims a man to be a rascal while professing the most sincere personal affection for him. In regard to the matter of my opposition to the licensing of plumbers, I have simply to say that the combined wisdom and experience of subsequent governments have not as yet effected any change in the old system. It is a matter which will require the most careful consideration before any radical change is made. As to my 'following the matter to the Legislature' and opposing the law there, and causing extra expense for counsel fees, etc., I declare all to be utterly false. A really important (if true) attack is made against my character when the alderman says: 'And I might also say that I have been confirmed in the position I have taken in this matter, when I found that certain parties are pressing him for this position. I think that a party has an interest in this matter outside of the public interest, and I hesitate to assist in that direction.'

"Now, it is difficult to know exactly what is meant by the above statement, but if Alderman McLean means to assert that I have ever been connected with any job, bill, or interest, directly or indirectly, of 'outside' or any other parties, I declare the same to be wholly and maliciously false,

and I challenge him for the proof. What a tremendous state of mental commotion the gentleman must have been laboring under when with a high sense of duty and honor he had the courage 'so reluctantly' to rise in his place and oppose the mayor's nominee on such strong grounds and with such unassailable arguments!

"We next pass to Alderman Whidden's remarks, which are very brief. The only assertion, or rather implication, which he makes is the following vague statement: 'The small amount of opposition that has been manifested to me, or to those through whom it was supposed to reach me, does not touch me at all. Other parties that were interested in the city business last year were injured because they were somewhat connected with me. But that does not trouble me at all.'

"Now, if the above language refers to the building of six gatehouses on the new work, which is the only matter I can think he had in mind, perhaps it would be as well to have all the facts made public. The city architect desired to have Mr. Whidden assist him in drawing up the specifications from the plans for the buildings, and proposed that he (Mr. Whidden) should submit a proposal to build three of them and Mr. Standish three, provided these bids came below the \$10,000 clause in the ordinance which provided that no contracts which entailed greater expenditures than that sum should be made without advertising for proposals in the daily papers. Mainly or partly at my suggestion in the board this was not done, but the architect instead was directed to invite twelve or more bidders in competition. This displeased Mr. Whidden and he refused to put in a bid. Perhaps this will explain his remarks.

"We pass next to the statement made by Alderman Stebbins. It is true that I opposed the taking of the Roxbury Almshouse for a smallpox hospital. If this be treason, let him make the most of it. It is also true that I opposed the fire commission, but I beg to ask the gentleman to refresh his memory in the facts of his own opposition in committee to the establishment of the commission. After my remarks on the subject, Alderman Stebbins came out in the anteroom, and pressing me warmly by the hand, declared he would rather be in my place than his own. I remarked to him that I honored him for his honesty, but I despised him for his lack of courage. In regard to my being blunt to the mayor, and making such remarks as 'Let him do the dirty work,' etc., I proclaim all utterly false, and refer him to His Honor for verification. As to my opposition to the establishment of the Boston Water Board, the statements are incorrect. I was not the most determined opposer of the scheme, and

I beg leave to refer him to the official minutes of the council, where he will find page after page—from Feb. 9, 1874, when the matter first came up, to March 22, 1876, when the final ordinance was adopted—of speeches and remarks made by a number of aldermen who were very much opposed to the scheme. As a matter of fact, I voted for the measure before my connection with the board ceased, and the only remarks I can now find of any kind or description whatever will be found on page 375 of the minutes of 1874, where, after stating my feelings in regard to the ordinance, I closed with the following words: ‘But you have got to do something with the water department. It is in a sickly condition. Let us learn what is best, and I will vote for it.’ The ordinance for which I voted, which action the gentleman says was influenced by the fact that I was to be appointed on the commission, was passed on June 29, 1874 (see page 401). My appointment as a member of the Water Board took place two years later, viz., July 6, 1876. These are the facts, which are stubborn things. The plumbing business, about which the learned alderman has so much to say, I have already alluded to; but I take further occasion to say that the remarks of Alderman Stebbins, as well as those of Alderman McLean, are false. I never went near the State House on this subject, or spoke to more than one legislator about it, and that was not after the action in committee had been taken.

“As to the remarks on the stringent rules adopted ahead for restraining and limiting the consumption of water by inspecting and stamping each stop-cock and cutting down the consumption of water to fourteen gallons per head, and which apparently, from the drift of his remarks, this alderman, so well posted on water matters, would hold up as a model for us to copy, I beg to say that, in my humble opinion, the adoption of such rigorous measures in our country at the present time, where our habits are so different, and where pure water is so much more easily obtained, would be against sound policy and against the wishes of the majority of the taxpayers. We agree with the alderman when he says, ‘but I am wandering a little from the subject.’

“Now we come to the matter of a house in the Suffolk Street district, of which I was the unfortunate owner. I pronounce at the start all the statements and inferences on this point false and malicious. The following is a true statement of the case: The city took possession of the house in question in 1871 and held it until 1873. When it was deeded back to me by the city I found the following condition of things:

“First—I had been partially deprived of rent for two years.

“Second—The plumbing had been stolen.

"Third—The walls were cracked and sprung so badly that I was notified by the inspector of buildings that the building was unsafe.

"Fourth—A stable had been built, by license of the Board of Aldermen, directly opposite my house, with a street only twelve feet wide intervening, notwithstanding we had been given to understand that no stable would be erected in the district.

"Fifth—I paid bills to the amount of \$1,200 to put the house in proper condition, which bills I have on file.

"Now for all this damage I was 'willing to take the sum of \$800,' according to the statement, and the committee thought it an outrage to offer me \$600. If it was such a crying wrong, why did not Alderman Stebbins, who was a member of the committee, say something about it at the time, make a minority report and go to the Board of Aldermen about it and expose me, instead of storing up such tremendous charges safely in his own mind for future use? By the way, was the alderman ever known to make a minority report on any subject? In regard to the case I named no sum, but left it to the judgment of the committee, telling them distinctly that I should abide by their decision. Mr. Winn's case I know nothing about; but were I guilty of taking advantage of a poor man by offering \$25 for a claim of over \$2,000, I would hasten to relieve my conscience by righting the wrong, if I had to do it at my own expense.

"Now, if any city official know of any 'gross outrage' in this matter as the alderman stated, I challenge him to come to the front, and no longer keep his light hid under a bushel. Would it not be better for the alderman to devote his time in reflecting upon his own errors, such an one, for instance, as the loss to the city of \$1,000,000 (so estimated by some) through the filling of the Northampton Street district, of which act the alderman was the author?

"I regret, Mr. Editor, to have been obliged to take up so much space in a matter of controversy, about which the public has, perhaps, but little interest, but let the odium rest upon those who opened the ball and who have now relieved their over-charged brain of all their vile surfeit. Certainly they must be better able to perform the normal functions of life with greater ease and vigor after such a discharge of high moral duty. For myself, I have learned from it all on what frail grounds a public servant can be attacked and slandered in character while endeavoring to administer to the best of his ability the trusts of the city placed in his keeping.

"Very truly yours,

"LEONARD R. CUTTER."

In reply to the above appeared May 3, 1878, the following statement from Mr. Stebbins:

"To the Editor of the Transcript:

"It is due to the public that one of the reckless statements contained in the communication of Mr. Leonard R. Cutter, published in the *Transcript* of Wednesday, should be noticed. Mr. Cutter asks, referring to remarks of mine, 'Would it not be better for the alderman to devote his time in reflecting upon his own errors—such an one, for instance, as the loss to the city of \$1,000,000 (so estimated by some) through the filling of the Northampton Street district, of which act the alderman was the author?' The act to which he refers was prepared in the city solicitor's office in accordance with the petition of the City Council, and the only objectionable provision contained in the act was an amendment adopted at the State House by which property owners dissatisfied with the assessment for filling their lands could surrender the same to the city.

"The total cost of the Northampton Street district improvement was \$268,563.26. This sum includes the cost of land for the extension of an important street, and the grading of Reed, Lenox, Thorndike, Hunneman and Fellowes Street.

"There has been received by the city for filling privates estates, etc., \$41,211.26, and there is still due the city \$25,283.98. If the suits now pending to compel the city to take surrendered property are decided adversely, there will be required about \$190,000 to pay for the estates, and the city will become the owner of property which ought to sell for nearly the award of the courts or referees. The facts here given are taken from official books and records, and are presented for the information of the public.

"The other statements contained in the communication of Mr. Cutter are as gross, unwarranted and as easily controverted by official records as the foregoing which I have taken the trouble to correct.

"S. B. STEBBINS.

"May 3, 1878."

In the third annual report, 1879, is the following account of some of the work accomplished:

"The board have still to say that it has consumed a great deal of time, and required almost constant thought, to look after and properly investigate the numerous claims for damages occasioned by the action of the city in providing an additional supply of pure water; and they feel just-

fied in remarking that this has been a service the difficulties of which can hardly be appreciated except by those who have had similar work to do. They hope and believe that they have been reasonably successful in rendering a full equivalent to individuals for all interference with their rights and property which a great public necessity made necessary, at the same time that they have protected the interests of the city and saved its treasury many times from payment of exorbitant and improper demands. The whole number of claims settled up to May 1, 1879, is two hundred and four. The amount paid for land and water damages to same date, \$930,527.23."

At this time Mr. Sawyer's term of three years expired, and Mr. Francis Thompson was appointed his successor.

The board organized with Leonard R. Cutter as chairman. The fourth annual report for 1880 contains the following items:

"The average daily consumption of water for the year 1879, including the Mystic works, was 34,579,370 gallons,—an increase of nine per cent over the consumption of 1878. The increased consumption from the Cochituate and Sudbury River supplies was ten and seven-tenths per cent in excess of the previous year, and amounted to over 25,000,000 gallons per day. This excessive use of water has caused the board no little anxiety, and it is evident that steps must be taken at once both to stop its wanton waste and to supply works to meet legitimate and largely growing demands.

"In the original scheme for the 'additional supply,' it was estimated that seven storage basins would be required in the Sudbury water-shed to secure a supply of 40,000,000 gallons per day; but that for some years a supply of 20,000,000 gallons would be sufficient, and that this amount would be secured by the construction of the three lowest basins on the river. These, already built, are now furnishing the water estimated, but it is clear to the minds of the Water Board that before a new basin can be built and properly prepared for service, including the loss of two or three working seasons, its services will be imperatively needed. The board, therefore, unanimously urge the City Council to take immediate steps towards the construction of an additional basin.

"The engineer estimates that the saving in the actual building of the new works over the estimated cost would more than pay for the basin asked for.

"Sudbury River has supplied to the city nearly 4,000,000,000 gallons or an average daily supply of over 10,000,000 gallons. A small portion

of this amount was diverted into Lake Cochituate, but the greater part was sent directly to Chestnut Hill Reservoir.

"Basins Nos. 1 and 3 were filled early in the year, but owing to delays in the construction of Basin No. 2, that basin was not filled until late in the summer.

"A large portion of the time of the Board has been taken up in the settlement of unadjusted claims against the city for land and water damages. Some of these were of an intricate and delicate character, but it is believed that they have been settled for the best interests of the city. A few cases still remain unsettled, and are now in the hands of the City Solicitor for trial.

"The question of expediency of removing the loam from the bottom of the storage basins has been brought before the Board several times during the year. On June 13, 1879, the Park Commissioners addressed a communication to them, representing the desirability of removing the loam for park purposes, and enclosing estimates and a report from the City Engineer in relation to the matter. These documents were at once forwarded to the City Council, with a request from the Water Board for a special appropriation; but as no action was arrived at, the basins, later in the season, had to be filled, to insure a supply for the city.

"In July, 1879, a very disagreeable vegetable growth of algæ appeared in Horn Pond, and spread quickly throughout the distribution of the system, causing great inconvenience to the water-takers. The evil was beyond any known remedy. The best experts were employed to investigate as to the cause, but without practical results. That the appearance of these plants is in no measure caused by sewage or other pollution is shown by the fact that the same growth has appeared in a precisely similar manner in one of the basins of the Sudbury River supply, on Stony Brook, a district free from danger of this sort.

"In conclusion, the Board desire to place upon record their regrets at the resignation of Mr. Jos. P. Davis, the late City Engineer. Thoroughly skilled in every detail connected with water supply, and deeply interested in the proper development of the water-works system, the loss of his counsel will be felt no more sincerely by any department of the city than by this Board.

"LEONARD R. CUTTER, Chairman,
ALBERT STANWOOD,
FRANCIS THOMPSON."

In the report of the City Engineer for 1880 is found the following regarding the quality of the water which caused so much trouble in subsequent years:


"The quality of the Cochituate water has been good throughout the year. The Sudbury River water has been somewhat colored and, at times, has had a slightly bitter taste which was noticed in the city late in the fall, when the water was sent directly into the distribution pipes without passing through Chestnut Hill reservoir.

"In the early part of September an abundant growth of algæ developed itself in Reservoir No. 3 of the Sudbury River works. The reservoir was immediately isolated from the rest of the supply, and, owing probably to that precaution, the algæ did not show themselves except in small quantity in Basin No. 1, Farm Pond, and Chestnut Hill Reservoir. The presence of the algæ in Reservoir No. 3 was observed until the beginning of December, when, the water having resumed its former quality, it was drawn as usual for the supply of the city. The plants observed were extremely minute, but grew in such quantities as to fill the water, to which they gave a mealy appearance; the portions near the surface of the water were often gathered together, by the action of the wind, into green patches, which were blown towards the lee shore. These microscopic algæ were of two kinds, one having a somewhat globular form, the other presenting the appearance of a curved string of beads. The quantities observed were constantly varying, increasing sometimes with wonderful rapidity. The cause of this growth is not known, and, with the present knowledge of these matters, no remedy can be applied; the formation of the algæ seems to be wholly independent of the depth of the water, but closely follows the changes of temperature, increasing when it rises, and diminishing when it lowers.

"The algæ were not observed in Reservoir No. 2, which is not as deep as Reservoir No. 3.

"The experience of the past year shows value of the independent connections of the reservoirs of the Sudbury River supply, without which it would have been impossible to prevent the contaminated water from reaching the distributing pipes of the city, to the great inconvenience of the water-takers.

"In July another alga, the *Clathrocystis*, similar to one of those observed in Reservoir No. 3, made its appearance in large quantities in the water of Horn Pond, from which it found its way into Mystic Pond and thence into the distributing pipes; being very minute, it could not



SUMMER RESIDENCE, JAFFREY, N. H.

be stopped by screens. It is somewhat remarkable that it should originate in the deep water of Horn Pond, and yet could not be found in the Abbajona River above the outlet of its tributary from this pond. The complaints about the quality of water became so numerous that, in the middle of August, the City Government instructed your Board to consider and report upon the expediency and cost of introducing a system of filtration in connection with the Mystic water supply. My predecessor, at your request, investigated the subject, and, in his report to your Board, made in November, came to the conclusion that the only practicable mode of filtering the whole of Mystic supply is by means of artificial filtering beds; it would require a very extensive filtering area, and the estimate of cost of such a scheme is \$427,000, which would be increased to \$507,000 if it was found necessary to cover the filter beds; this expenditure was not recommended.

"I would call the attention of your Board to the following extract of Mr. Davis's report upon the filtration of the Mystic water: 'If vegetable growth shall prove as troublesome in the future as it has been in the past few years, some steps, such as by filtration, by connection with the Cochituate works, by seeking a new source, or by employing temporary expedients, must be taken.'

"Your Board has already had under consideration one of the above considerations,—that of connecting the Mystic works by an independent pipe with Chestnut Hill Reservoir. Should the growth of algæ develop itself again in the Mystic supply, this costly scheme would be looked upon more favorably if the pipe was to be partly used for furnishing a supply of water to the city of Cambridge which has already manifested its intention of entering into negotiations with the city of Boston for that purpose.

"In November the algæ disappeared from Mystic Lake and the water resumed its ordinary condition."

In this report occurred the name of Mr. Henry M. Wightman as City Engineer in place of Mr. Joseph P. Davis, resigned.

In 1881 Mr. Cutter's second term of three years expired, and Mayor F. O. Prince nominated him for another term. After some discussion he was confirmed.

The daily press furnished the following account of the confirmation as it came before the Common Council:

CONFIRMATION OF WATER COMMISSIONER CUTTER.

The message of the Mayor appointing Leonard R. Cutter as a member of the Water Board came up as a matter laid over from the last meeting.

The question was on confirming the nomination.

Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16 moved to proceed to ballot on the confirmation.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12—I move, on the contrary, that the nomination be laid on the table, and that the Committee on Ordinances be instructed to consider and report upon the expediency of amending the ordinance in regard to the Water Board so that the members may hold their offices for three years or until their successors are appointed. My reason is this: The present ordinance, as I read it, makes it imperative that the commissioners shall be elected only for three years. Consequently under the present law we should be obliged before the first of May to confirm the nominee or to leave a vacancy. I think, on the contrary, that a good many persons would be willing to continue the present nominee simply by letting him continue without being confirmed, because I think the public is not satisfied with the conduct of the Water Board. It may be their misfortune, but certainly they have had very bad luck for the last year. The city of Boston has had nothing but complaint for the enormous expenditure which has been made; we have had nothing but water unfit to drink for the last six months, and the commissioners are engaged in expensive litigation in regard to the Mystic Valley, involving an enormous amount. I, for one, do not feel satisfied with the action of the Water Board collectively. I have no charges against individuals, nothing more against the chairman than against any other member of the Board; but I do believe that it is public opinion that some change in that department before long should be made. While I am perfectly willing to let the matter lie on the table merely, yet that will have the real effect of turning out Mr. Cutter on the first day of May, which I do not think is a proper step to take; and I therefore move to lay the nomination on the table, in order, if that should be the view of the Council, that we may amend the ordinance so that it shall read “for three years, or until his successor is appointed.” If there is any such ordinance now I should like to hear it read, and in that case I will merely move to lay the nomination upon the table. Boston must feel like finding fault with her Water Commissioners for the discharge of their duties

during the past year. I do not think they are up to their task, but I do not think any one member is more at fault than another. I think some greater efficiency in that department might be secured, and for that reason I should be glad to let the Board stand just where it is if we can do that.

Mr. Parkman of Ward 9—I would like to ask the gentleman, if his motion is carried, whether on the first day of May we shall not have only two members of the Water Board.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12—I was singularly unfortunate in not explaining myself, that I wished to provide that the Committee on Ordinances shall amend the ordinances so that the members of the Board shall continue three years, or until their successors are appointed. In that case the Board would continue until after the first day of May. I did not know when the gentleman rose but there might be some general provision in regard to officers which would cover it. I meant to have it distinctly understood that I do not wish to lay the present incumbent aside; on the other hand I do not wish to be called upon to vote for his confirmation at this time.

Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16—I hope the motion of the gentleman from Ward 12 will not prevail. If the gentleman is confirmed now, the ordinances can be verified afterward.

Mr. Wharton of Ward 11—I think the gentleman makes a mistake in moving that this appointment be laid upon the table. He could accomplish the same object by specially assigning it to the next meeting at eight o'clock, and then make a motion that the Committee on Ordinances be ordered to make the change required and report at the next meeting.

Mr. Huntress of Ward 11—I do not understand that Mr. Cutter being elected last year holds his office by vote of the Council to extend his term of office. No change in the ordinance can change the period for which he was elected.

Mr. Parkman of Ward 9—I see another objection. Suppose the Committee on Ordinances should report an ordinance next Thursday, it cannot be passed until after the first of May; and then we cannot legislate Mr. Cutter back by any ordinance which we shall enact thereafter.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12—There is a great doubt, I believe, whether or not the Water Commissioners are legally in office at the present time. I will move to specially assign the matter until next Thurs-

day, and between that time I will pledge myself to find out from the other members of the Committee on Ordinances, who have studied all these topics very carefully, as to whether it will be in fact legal for us to elect for three years. That was one point I intended to bring up later, but it has come to my mind now. And I assure the Council that this offer is made without the slightest intention to interfere with their opinions in regard to the Mayor's appointments, but in regard to our legal powers in electing for three years at this time. I think it is a matter that the committee should proceed to get the opinion of the City Solicitor upon, as to whether this is one of the offices or not. My impression is that it is.

The President—Do you withdraw the motion to lay on the table?
Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12—I do.

Mr. Wharton of Ward 11—I should like to ask the gentleman from Ward 12 if he makes that motion with reference to leaving the further question of the ordinances to the Committee on Ordinances.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12—I rest entirely on the importance of consulting the City Solicitor in regard to the question of the three years' term of this particular office at this time; and I think my associate will see that this is one of those questions.

Mr. Wharton of Ward 11—I cannot see any object whatever in specially assigning this appointment, unless we do it to get the opinion of a committee of this body upon this difficult question. I understand the gentleman from Ward 12 to avoid answering me as to whether or not he refers this question to the Committee on Ordinances.

The President—If the gentleman will pardon the Chairman, I may shorten the debate by saying that the appointment reads as follows: "I hereby appoint, subject to your approval and confirmation, Leonard R. Cutter to be a member of the Water Board *for the term* beginning the first Monday in May, 1881." I merely call attention to the fact that it does not refer to any term of three years.

Mr. Bigelow of Ward 25 moved the previous question, but modified his motion so as to limit the debate to two minutes. The motion as amended was lost—yeas 21, nays 22.

Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16 moved the previous question, and it was carried—30 to 20.

The main question was upon the motion to proceed to ballot for the confirmation, and the motion prevailed.

Messrs. Fitzpatrick of Ward 8, Folan of Ward 13 and Lovell of Ward 1 were appointed a committee to receive, sort and count votes, and a ballot was taken with the following result:

Whole number of votes cast	55
Necessary for confirmation	28
Yes	42
No	13

And Mr. Cutter was declared to be confirmed.

Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16 moved a reconsideration, hoping it would not prevail.

Mr. Fitzpatrick of Ward 8 moved to adjourn. The motion was declared lost. Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12 doubted the vote, and, on a division, six members voted to adjourn, and thirty-two against.

THE WATER BOARD.

The mayor's message, appointing, subject to confirmation, Leonard R. Cutter as a member of the Boston Water Board, came up as unfinished business, and Mr. Rosnosky of Ward 16 moved that the Council proceed to a ballot.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12 moved to lay the matter on the table, in order that he might afterward offer a motion to instruct the Committee on Ordinances to report an ordinance which should provide that members of the Water Board shall hereafter hold office for terms of three years, or until their successors are appointed.

Considerable debate ensued, and Mr. Whitmore finally withdrew the motion which he had made, moving, instead, the special assignment of the matter to the next meeting.

Mr. Wharton of Ward 11 suggested that, if the matter was specially assigned, the gentleman from Ward 12 could obtain action by the Committee on Ordinances.

Mr. Lovell of Ward 1 said he believed the real English of Mr. Whitmore's action was that it meant opposition to Mr. Cutter.

Mr. Whitmore of Ward 12 disclaimed any hostility to Mr. Cutter, stating that his sole object was to ascertain if the present mode of confirming commissioners for three years was legal.

The previous question was ordered—30 to 20—and the nomination of

Mr. Cutter was confirmed, 42 gentlemen voting in the affirmative, 13 in the negative.

In the fifth annual report, for 1881, is found the following in regard to the quality of the water:

"The water from this source has caused a great deal of trouble during the past year; the cucumber taste having again made its appearance, notwithstanding the steps taken last year to improve the meadows around the lake. On February 26 the supply from this source was cut off, since which time it has been maintained wholly by the Sudbury River. The surface of the lake was drawn down during the year 1880 about eight feet, to a point too low to keep up the full flow in the aqueduct. In order to guard against a threatened scarcity of water, the Board purchased pumps and boilers to erect at the gatehouse to keep up the supply, but fortunately they were not needed. The machinery is stored at Chestnut Hill Reservoir, ready for a similar emergency, should one occur in the future.

"Every means known to the Board have been taken to investigate the cause of the peculiar taste which occasionally visits the waters of the lake. On January 26 an order was approved by the Mayor, requesting a report from the Board on the cause and prevention of the impurity of the water supplied to the city, and on February 10 the following report was made, and is here reprinted, as forming a portion of the history of this matter:

" 'City of Boston, City Hall,

" 'Boston Water Board Office, Feb. 10, 1881.

" 'To the City Council:

" 'The Boston Water Board having been requested, by an order approved Jan. 26, 1881, to report "on the cause and prevention of the impurity in the water supplied to the city," would respectfully report that, at the time of the passage of the order by the City Council the city was supplied with water from both the Sudbury and Cochituate sources, in the proportion of about one-third Cochituate to two-thirds Sudbury. The Board having become satisfied that the peculiar taste to the water, known commonly as the "cucumber" taste, was due to the Cochituate's water, caused this source to be shut off from the supply, and since then the water has much improved in taste if not in color.

" 'Although the Board have taken every means in their power to ascertain the cause of the "cucumber" taste, they have arrived at no

result. Chemical analysis throws no more light on the subject now than it did in 1876, when the same trouble visited the water. At that time extended examinations and experiments were made, and a detailed report made to the Council. The recent analyses and examinations made by experts throw no more light on the subject than they did then.

"While the water seems to be perfectly clear, and, so far as the Board can say, perfectly wholesome, the disagreeable taste permeates a large body of water in a short time and in a mysterious manner.

"The report of Prof. Nichols, of Feb. 3, 1881, containing the analyses, is submitted herewith.

"Respectfully submitted,

"BOSTON WATER BOARD,"

"By LEONARD R. CUTTER, Chairman."

"Massachusetts Institute of Technology,

"Boston, Feb. 3, 1881.

"To the Water Board of the City of Boston:

"GENTLEMEN,—The accompanying table contains the results of the examination of three samples of water, two of which were furnished me by Mr. Fitzgerald, and one of which was drawn in my laboratory on February 1.

"The water received in the city at the present time is entirely from the Sudbury River. It has a marked yellowish-brown color and a decidedly "pondy" taste. The water is more strongly colored and contains a larger amount of dissolved matter than usual, and is about the same in character as that received in the city about a year ago when, for a short time, the water came directly from the Sudbury sources. The water is somewhat objectionable in appearance, owing to its marked color; it is also not altogether palatable, but I do not think it can be called unwholesome. It is a soft surface water, rather highly charged with vegetable matter, and I have no doubt that many persons who are accustomed to hard surface waters or to well water would suffer some derangement of the digestive organs if they should begin to drink freely of this water. Probably also some sick persons might be affected by it; but I believe that, as far as a person in average health is concerned, the water is wholesome.

"As to the so-called "cucumber" taste which, until within a few days, has been noticed over the greater part of the city, there is little

that I can say in addition to what has already been said in a report by Dr. Farlow, Mr. Edward Burgess, and myself, presented in April, 1876. Although since that date I have visited other water supplies and made a number of experimental and other observations, I have been unable to satisfy myself as to the cause of the trouble. Whether it is due to a peculiar decomposition of the dead organic matter in the water, or whether some living organism is concerned in its formation, is not known. As far as my information goes, there is no evidence to show that a water possessing this peculiar taste is less wholesome than the same water when free from the taste.

“Yours respectfully,

“WM. RIPLEY NICHOLS.”

The City Engineer reports as follows on the quality of the water:

“The quality of the water during the past year has been, at times, objectionable; the disagreeable taste complained of several times in previous years has again appeared, and has been located in Lake Cochituate at a time when the conditions for a good supply were never better. The meadows on the south side of Central Turnpike have been kept covered with a good depth of water, by means of the dam built last year, as have also the Hanchett meadows, while as the lake lowered all the water from Pegan Brook was filtered through the new gravel dam.

“The water in the lake was free from algæ and appeared clear and pure, but the fishy or cucumber taste was very strongly marked. The cause for this bad taste is still unknown, notwithstanding all the investigations that have been made by scientists in this and other localities where it has been noticed.

“The vegetable growths observed in 1879 have been found again in the Mystic supply, and in two of the Sudbury River reservoirs. In the latter, owing to the double system of reservoirs which allows a complete separation of the two branches of the river and the isolation of either from the rest of the supply, the trouble from this source has been very much lessened. In the Mystic, although it gave promise of being very bad at one time, it was dissipated by some unknown cause, and did not appear to an objectionable extent either in the lake or distribution.

“Notwithstanding the objectionable quality of the water, caused by the presence of algæ, and the cucumber or fishy taste, two evils which are entirely distinct from one another, it should be stated that, in the

opinion of some of the best authorities, this abnormal condition of the water has no injurious effect upon the public health."

During the fall of this year, 1881, occurred the great hue and cry regarding the poor quality of the water, and the members of the Water Board were held responsible for a great deal which was beyond them or any human power. The press had a great deal to say about it. People who knew about it, people who thought they knew about it, and people who knew absolutely nothing about it, expressed their opinions in print. The following cuttings from the papers of the day are a few of the many that were in circulation at that time; they will speak for themselves. Among them are some letters and reported interviews with Mr. Cutter, Chairman of the Board, who was trying in his uniformly honest way to do all in his power to avert the trouble.

The Boston *Herald* dated Nov. 21, 1881, contained the following:

SUDBURY WATER SUPPLY.

IS THE WATER CONTAMINATED IN FARM POND OR BEYOND?—

MR. GEORGE H. NORMAN THINKS THAT THE TROUBLE
IS IN THE WATER AND NOT IN ANY BASIN.

It will be remembered that, in the interview with Mr. Leonard R. Cutter, Chairman of the Water Board, on the return of the Mayor and Water Board from an examination of the sources of supply from Sudbury River and Lake Cochituate, on Thursday of last week, and which was published in the *Herald* on Friday, he spoke of the Mayor inviting his friend, Mr. George H. Norman, a gentleman who has probably a larger experience in the construction of water works than any other man in the country, to accompany the party. Mr. Cutter advised that Mr. Norman be seen and asked his opinion of our water system and the trouble with the waters from Sudbury River which come through Farm Pond. Mr. Norman was found at his residence, No. 343 Beacon Street, last evening, and asked if he would talk upon the water question. He said, in reply:

"I do not know that what I might tell you would be worth making an article of for the *Herald*, but you can judge of that when you hear what I have to say. As already published by you, I accompanied Mayor Prince and the gentlemen of the Water Board on Thursday last to the

Sudbury River basins and Lake Cochituate. We first visited Farm Pond, which was then being drawn off into Chestnut Hill Reservoir. I made an examination of portions of the banks of the pond where the water had receded, but found nothing objectionable there—nothing that could possibly affect the water so as to make it taste or smell badly. There was, in the places tested, a thin layer of vegetable matter—probably the remains of leaves and other vegetation, which had been in the water, but had been deposited there by the eddies on the side of the pond, or thrown up by the action of the waves at the water line. At the time of our visit a number of men were at work gathering up this vegetable mould. I took up some of it, and put it into my mouth, but could find no taste in it, and there was no disagreeable smell from it. Before visiting Farm Pond I had been led to believe that the source of contamination of the water was located there. But when I saw how small the pond was—its capacity when full not exceeding 130,000,000 gallons—and that it was only equal to the amount of water that flows through it in four or five days, it became at once apparent to my mind that, if water in such a small place could be contaminated, as it was contaminated from some source, the cause would not be hard to locate—it must, in fact, be quite conspicuous. Now the reason why the Water Board concluded that the trouble was in Farm Pond was that that was the point where the water was first found to taste and smell badly, and that above it, in basin No. 2, the water seemed to be good enough. Of course, there are all kinds of stories afloat in regard to the origin of the bad taste, some seeming to be rational enough, while others are built upon theories rather than upon facts and experience; and I will acknowledge that a correct judgment of the cause or causes of the apparent contamination of our drinking waters, from an absence of general knowledge of the subject, is not easy to form. My experience in dealing with water supplies for a number of years has led me to believe that the trouble of taste or smell in drinking water is inherent in the water itself. From this I concluded that the water was contaminated before it reached Farm Pond—that is, that before it passed into the conduit leading to Farm Pond the mischief was done.”

“But in basins No. 2 and 3 the taste and smell were not perceptible?”

“That is true; but then the water at the surface of these basins, which are comparatively very large, had an opportunity to become aerated by the action of the winds, etc., and, in this way, purified from smell and

taste. But it has not been tested in those ponds at various depths below the surface. If it were, a new light might be thrown on the whole subject. I learn from a member of the Water Board that, in 1875, when there was trouble with the supply at the Bradlee basin at Chestnut Hill, the water, which, at the surface, was not objectionable, was found, at eleven feet below, to be quite foul, while below the stratum of foul water, and near the bottom of the basin, the water was found to be comparatively good, but not quite so good as that taken from the surface. Mr. Cutter of the Board relates that, some two years ago, when on a visit with a jury to basin No. 1—which empties into Sudbury River—a foul smell resembling that from a dead rat, was noticed in the gatehouse. His attention was called to it, and he asked the superintendent what the cause of it was. The latter did not know, though it evidently came from the water which was being drawn off. There are three openings into the conduit from the basin in question, one above the other, and Mr. Cutter ascertained that water was being drawn from the middle opening. He told the superintendent to shut it off from the middle gate and open the lower one. This was done, and the water coming therefrom emitted no odor whatever. He then directed that the upper gate be opened and the lower one closed. The result was the same as in the former case—no odor. To satisfy himself that it was the water which flowed from the middle gate which caused the smell, Mr. Cutter ordered it opened again and the upper gate closed. The moment this was done the disagreeable odor once more became apparent and pervaded the gatehouse. Last April the water in Lake Cochituate became bad, and the supply from this source was cut off and efforts were made to ascertain what the trouble was. Mr. Stanwood of the Board told me that, while the water at the top and bottom of the lake seemed to be good and pure, he found the water some ten or twelve feet below the surface to be bad tasting and disagreeable. These facts would go to show that the trouble with the water in Farm Pond might originate in the supply basins beyond, and yet be not perceptible at the surface. When the water flows into Farm Pond through the conduit, there must necessarily be a commingling of the various strata of waters in the basins furnishing the supply. Now, if there should be a middle stratum of foul water in these ponds, and it commingled with the water strata above and below, it might and would impregnate them with its own disagreeable qualities. I cannot, indeed, see any other rational explanation of the trouble, for Farm Pond is so small—receiving a volume of water equal to nearly one-fourth of its

capacity every twenty-four hours—that the water does not remain long enough in it to receive the required aeration to make it sweet and odorless, and it therefore passes out of it in about the same condition in which it came from the supply basins through the conduit into it. Then, again, the water does not stay long enough in Farm Pond to be impregnated with the chemical impurities of decomposed or decomposing vegetable matter, which, in the form of algæ, etc., is no doubt the cause of the bad odor and taste of the Sudbury water. What has been related by Mr. Cutter and other members of the Board regarding the impurity of water below a surface of good tasting water has been confirmed by my own experience. As already reported in your paper, we found on our visit to the Sudbury River and supply basins that the water everywhere had an agreeable taste on the surface—was, in fact, good drinking water. We were not prepared to test the water below the surface, or we might, in my opinion, have a different story to tell. My special errand on that visit was to see if I could find on the borders of Farm Pond, or on the watershed which supplied the basins 2 and 3, any objectionable vegetation or organic matter which, in my opinion, might be the cause of contamination of the waters. The result of my examination was that the vegetation near pond and basins, and prevailing over the watershed surrounding them, was as free from objection as any I have ever seen in similar localities. I am aware that a great number of people have an idea that the loam or black mud in the bottom of water basins imparts a bad taste to the waters. There are, no doubt, certain gases in the loam or mud of artificial ponds or reservoirs, which go into the water when it first covers it, and may give the water a disagreeable taste or odor, or both; but once this first water is passed off, there is no more taste or smell to be noted, and the water is as good and pure as though it rested upon a granite bottom. All natural ponds have loam and mud at their bottoms, and all artificial ponds will sooner or later have such accumulations in their depths, even though formed of gravel or stone. The Bradlee basin at Chestnut Hill had a gravel bottom, and its banks were lined with granite, and yet its water was found to be bad, when the water in the Lawrence basin, which supplies it, and had a muddy or loamy bottom, was good. The only trouble that might arise from this mud in the bottom of a pond is, that if the pond were shallow and covered a large area a high wind might have the effect of making it roily; but, even then, the matter in suspension would be tasteless and innocuous if swallowed in drinking the water. Now, I under-

stand that the curious pond plants—the algæ—are multiplied and grow with astonishing rapidity when the water is at a temperature of 79 degrees Fahrenheit and the weather settled, with no winds prevailing. We have had quite a number of days of such weather during the past late summer season. Then we had, early in October, a sudden change in temperature, frost, and several days of very cold weather. At that time the water in the basins and river was so low as to be in a condition to receive a sudden chill. This probably had the effect of killing the tender algæ, which, no doubt, had been propagated in immense quantities, and of their decomposing remains giving to the waters of the basins the properties so lately complained of. Now, you will remember that the equinoctial storm did not pay us a visit this fall. If it had come, it is my opinion that its disturbance of the waters in the large basins would have purified them and thrown off the disagreeable taste and odor. But it did not come, and the dead algæ, settling down in the water, impregnated it as we have experienced. I remember that some five years ago the Croton water of New York had a very bad smell for a time, but the taste was not affected. It is not easy to judge of the conditions which, from apparently similar causes, would make the water in one instance smell bad and not affect the taste, and in another make both taste and smell bad. In the present case I do not see—with the existing system of shallow basins in use for Sudbury water—how the trouble could have been averted by any mechanical means. The best thing that, in my opinion, can be done, is to complete the retaining basin No. 4, the water in which would be some forty feet in depth, and not, therefore, liable to the same conditions of sudden change of temperature and the consequent destruction of algæ and other vegetable life, which, in health and vitality, are found in the purest waters, which they undoubtedly benefit. There is nothing to be done to correct the bad condition of the Sudbury River water which nature will not accomplish in its time and way. There is some talk that the Water Board may build a conduit through Farm Pond basin, to bring the water past it without contact with its bed and shores. Whatever mechanical appliances may be adopted to this end, if the water has in the mean time resumed its normal taste and condition, the change for the better will be attributed to them and not to the change in the water or its self-purification. Thus it may be possible that, in its anxiety to serve the citizens of Boston with good water, the Water Board may be led into useless expenditure. But there is one thing certain, and that is that, if the water is—as I firmly believe it is—contaminated

in the depths of the basins which supply Farm Pond, and remains so for any length of time, no new conduit can change its quality; and I firmly believe that, if it came into Farm Pond free from odor and bad taste, it would leave it in the same condition."

"You then went to Lake Cochituate. What is your opinion of the condition of Pegan brook?"

"My visit to Pegan brook—or rather its point of outlet into the lake—revealed to me a kind of reservoir of the foulest water I ever saw in large quantity. It contained the gathering of the sewage and street washings of the town of Natick for the past two years, and was of a white, slimy consistence. It was shut off from the waters of the lake by a dam, and a portion of the water, holding the offensive matter in solution, was filtered through into the lake, some of it through a surface of charcoal. The water thus received by the lake must affect it in a measurable degree, but it is mixed with such a vast volume of water that it can have no effect upon the health of those using the water. Now, people seem to have an idea that the whole of the late trouble with the water originated in Lake Cochituate, whereas—though the only source of pollution that I could detect was on its borders—its waters have been exceptionally free from any disagreeable taste and very pure. It should, therefore, be left out of the present discussion in regard to the bad water supply. This Pegan brook sewage, it may be remarked, is no acquisition to the waters of Lake Cochituate, though, if the brook were allowed to run freely into the lake, I doubt if the influence of the sewage, etc., it contained would be at all perceptible or render the water of the lake unwholesome, so small is the quantity that would run in and so vast is the amount with which it would mingle. But, in its present condition, I should say that it constituted a very serious danger to the town of Natick, by poisoning with malarial gases, etc., the air which its people must breathe."

"Can this sewage be readily disposed of elsewhere than in Lake Cochituate?"

"Undoubtedly it can. It might be easily diverted into Sudbury River below the water supply to our water basins at an expense not exceeding \$150,000. The sewage of Pegan brook can be readily disposed of in this way, and I would advise, for the benefit of its inhabitants, that the town at once set about diverting it to Sudbury River. It is the only source of contamination of our water supply that I can see over which we can have any control, and it ought to be removed without delay."

The Boston *Herald*, Nov. 23, 1881, contained the following account:

WATER CONTAMINATION.

WHAT PROF. SHARPLES HAS TO SAY ABOUT OUR WATER SUPPLY.—
RESULTS OF HIS EXAMINATION OF MANY SAMPLES.—ALGÆ
KILLED BY SUDDEN CHANGES OF TEMPERATURE.

In conversation, on Monday, Professor Sharples—who had lately returned from a two-weeks trip out west, on professional business—gave some interesting information in regard to periodical contaminations of contained many facts that would be timely to revive at this time, when drinking waters. Nearly three years ago, before the Microscopical Society in Boston, he read a paper on the taste and smell of water, which the public is interested in the subject. Said he:

"I have just read the *Herald* interview with Mr. George H. Norman, which was published this morning, and regard his utterances as those of a thoroughly practical man, who has had much experience in water works and water supply. He takes a common-sense view of his subject, and, as far as he goes, is, in my estimation, correct. The origin of the taste and smell of Sudbury River water, while undoubtedly mostly derived from vegetable matter in the water itself, is not well enough known to define the location of the defilement. To say that, because the surface water of the river and supply basins has no bad taste or smell, the trouble is not there, is not at all conclusive. The water ought to be taken from various depths in the basins, the river and its tributaries, especially along the banks of the river and its affluents, and a series of careful analyses and study made, before an intelligent opinion of the cause or causes of the trouble can be arrived at. The city ought to employ a competent chemist, and give him about five years in which to study up the whole question. It can hardly be done in less time."

"What would the services of such a chemist cost per year?"

"About \$3,000."

"That would be \$15,000 in all."

"Yes; but what of that? It is a very small amount in comparison to the sums that may be spent to remedy the trouble, and no remedy be reached, after all, on account of the lack of knowledge which exists in regard to its real nature. It would be better to spend \$15,000 to know how to remedy an evil than \$50,000 to try experiments, all of which would most probably amount to nothing."

"You have had considerable experience in analyzing drinking waters, have you not?"

"I have made many analyses of waters for several years past, often with special reference to the origin of the peculiar taste and smell which at times prevailed in the various ponds, basins, lakes, etc. I may say that the matter of the taste and smell of some pond waters has been within a few years the subject of extended inquiries, and has elicited a number of monographs. The first of these, as far as I am aware, was published in 1854, at which time Drs. Hayes and Jackson indulged in a rather spicy debate before the Natural History Society upon the peculiar taste of Cochituate water, one insisting that it was caused by oil from the bodies of cyclops, the other strenuously insisting that any one could see with a single eye that cyclops had nothing to do with it, but that the smell was occasioned by the decay of vegetable matter. My attention was first called to this matter in 1873, when I was requested by the town of Melrose to examine the water of Eel Pond or Crystal Lake, which is situated near Wyoming station in that town. The water of this pond had become exceedingly offensive, so that the people living on its banks were compelled to close their windows when the wind was blowing from the lake. A chemical examination of the water failed to show any cause for this state of affairs. A microscopical examination showed that the water was full of fragments of a vegetable nature, which from later experience I am disposed to think were *clathrocystis ænginosa*. The water, which is generally quite clear, had become quite thick and opaque. In 1875 Cochituate water again acquired a bad taste and smell, and at this time, and for several years afterward, was the subject of an extended investigation and report by Messrs. Farlow, Nichols and Burgess. In 1877 Mr. Lattimore made an investigation into the peculiar taste and smell of Hemlock Lake, which supplies the city of Rochester, N. Y. None of these gentlemen arrived at any definite conclusions in regard to the matter except Professor Lattimore, but all reported that they were unable to find any cause for such a condition of the water. Rensselaer Lake, from which Albany, N. Y., derives its water supply, was affected in a similar manner some years ago. Professor Chandler, to whom the matter was referred, ascribed it to the decay of vegetable matter, caused by the flooding of the banks of the lake. In that case the dam was lowered and the lake soon recovered its normal state. In 1877 there were loud complaints of the state of the water in Fresh Pond, Cambridge, and, as chemist to the Water Board, I was called upon to investigate the matter.



RESIDENCE, 27 HANCOCK STREET.

1864 — 1883.

I found in this case that the water was full of clathrocystis in a semi-decomposed condition. In this case the disagreeable state of the water continued for some weeks, and there has been but little trouble from it since. Some two years ago last summer there was great complaint about the water of Mystic Lake. Here, according to the accounts published in the papers at the time, there was a great and sudden increase in the amount of vegetation in the water. This, decaying in the pipes, made the water very offensive. The smell and taste, however, were at once ascribed to the Woburn tanneries, and vigorous measures were at once taken to suppress the undoubted nuisance existing at that point. Meanwhile the usual improvement took place in the water. The tanneries, however, being suppressed, the improvement was ascribed to that cause. Two other cases came under my notice that summer, and they occurred in two ponds that are situated in the same vicinity. The first, which was investigated by myself, was in the artificial pond owned by the Highland water works at Winchester, Mass. The other case was that of Spot Pond, from which the towns of Malden and Melrose draw their water supply. In these cases clathrocystis was not present, but another plant, which is *cælos phærrium*. In the Highland pond this was very abundant. In this case there were no tanneries to visit the nuisance on, not even a barnyard. So it was settled that the horned pout, of which there are quite a number in the pond, were the guilty parties, and I found the guardian busily employed in catching the young fish on their breeding places, a proceeding which I at once stopped, as in all probability fish of any kind in a water supply do more toward keeping it pure than any accidental damage that they may do by dying in it. The water at the Highland lake in due time recovered its normal condition, and I have heard no complaints of it since. Now, in regard to the bad odor of the waters, I am disposed to differ from Messrs. Burgess, Farlow and Nichols, who all unite in practically saying that no adequate cause has been assigned, and agree with Professor Lattimore. In the first place, these tastes and smells, so far as I know, have never been observed except at certain seasons of the year. If we have a sudden hot spell in June, we are very apt to hear complaints of the water. Some of these plants do not seem to tolerate hot weather. When once they have communicated the odor to the water it is very persistent, and all, or nearly all, traces of the plants may have disappeared, and yet the odor remains. Professor Lattimore remarks that the odor could not be perceived in the reservoir, and was very slightly perceptible in the pipes near to the

source, and was worse in the more distant parts of the city. Dr. Jackson says of the taste and smell in 1854, that they were worst in the dead ends of the pipes. In 1877 the smell and taste were much the worst in the dead ends of the pipes at Cambridge. In 1879 there had been no complaints of the water at Cambridge, or, at most, only very slight complaint, and the water was remarkably pure. Yet, on returning to my home in that city, after a month's absence, I found the water at my house absolutely undrinkable. It had the smell of a privy that had been neglected, and the taste was so persistent in the pipes that it was disagreeable to drink for at least twenty-four hours, although it was allowed to run freely for an hour."

"Would such water be fit to drink?"

"As to the effect on health of such conditions of water, we have no means of knowing whether or no any injurious effects can be directly traced to it. It is certainly disagreeable while it lasts, and so far we seem to have no remedy for it."

"Is there no way of ridding the water of the plants which render it foul by their decomposition?"

"None that I am aware of that can be employed on a large scale. Every household, however, can have some control of its own water supply. When the plants are very abundant they may readily be removed by filtering the water through a piece of old sheeting tied over the mouth of the faucet in such a manner as to form a bag, and the taste and smell may be both removed by boiling the water and allowing it to cool."

"Then, if I understand you rightly, you do not take much stock in the theory that the taste and smell came from dead eels in the water pipes?"

"I have not given this theory much attention as yet. But I do think that in every case, as far as reported, the smell and taste can be traced to the decay of vegetable or animal matter, and that this decay is generally caused by some sudden change in temperature, or by the water standing for a long time stagnant in the pipes."

"Have you examined the Sudbury River water since the prevalence of the present trouble?"

"I have not. I have been absent from the city for some little time, and my attention has been directed to other matters. But, when that cold spell occurred in the early part of October, I knew that there would be trouble with the water, for it no doubt killed most of the algæ in Sudbury River and its supply basins. Sudden changes, from heat to cold, or

vice versa, will kill the algæ or other pond plants which infest our drinking water, and which, while healthy, are, like fish, a benefit rather than an injury to it; but, when they exist in vast quantities in the water, and they are killed by any cause, their decomposition will give a disagreeable taste and smell to it."

THE WATER.

AN INTERESTING INTERVIEW WITH DR. BARNES.

Dr. Henry J. Barnes of this city gives to a reporter of the *Herald* the following account of his observations and conclusions: "I know," said Dr. Barnes, "that the cause of the pollution of the water continues to be a very debatable question. This is especially so with the gentlemen of the Water Board, who seem to begin and end all their investigations with the determination that the cause shall not be known. Now, if any man will take the trouble to visit the Sudbury River basins," continued Dr. Barnes, "the first thing that will attract his attention will be the absence of vegetable mould or soil around the margins of the ponds in certain places, marking stages of the water, and it will also be observed that the underlying gravel or sand is exposed chiefly at the stage of high water, where the banks are steep; and where this surface material has gone will be revealed by watching the little waves as they assail the banks and tear away this substance, dissolving or taking it into suspension, to deposit it at a lower level, completely disintegrating the whole, a process of nature continually going on either at high or low water as long as the material lasts. In the plainest language, it makes the water roily, from decaying vegetable and animal material (for both have been killed by drowning), as well as barnyard products, for it is not all meadow land thus overflowed. I have many times seen the mowing machine cutting good English grass on what are now beds of the ponds. It is presumed, therefore, that farmers who are as noted as those of Framingham for intelligence would plough and put manure on their lands bearing English hay. At the low stages of the water a part of this material deposited on exposed flats is subjected to the sun's rays, and in warm weather active decomposition and fermentation is brought on, as is evident from their spongy or porous condition, as well as the stench. Here, it is claimed, is the origin of our trouble, for Sudbury River, above these reservoirs, is good tasting water; below, it is all bad, and worst in Farm Pond, that

being the immediate receptacle of this filthy water, because here, spread over a wide surface, the current is slow, thus giving a longer time for a thorough maceration and solution of those particles which can be dissolved in water. Farm Pond, before this diversion of Sudbury River, was as clear a sheet of water as any I am familiar with. I have seen the clean gravel bottom from almost every part. It is now dark and turbid, and cannot be looked into more than a foot at the deepest part, which receives the greatest amount of sediment and becomes the worst tasting. The gates open into the new conduit, taking the water direct to Chestnut Hill, and here again we have the same conditions as at Farm Pond, and almost equally as bad tasting water. From here it is distributed over the low service of the city, and we know from taste, look and smell, how bad it is. To form an imperfect estimate of the amount of sediment still contained in the water, let any man examine the water tank in the upper story of his house, where the minimum amount is deposited, for the slow feed and high elevation gives an opportunity for much to settle in the pipes before it is emptied into these tanks. The lower faucets, drawing, as many do, on a level with the street mains, give the maximum amount of filth, or that which is usually used for cooking and drinking." Here Dr. Barnes exhibited to the *Herald* attaché a glass jar, which contained about a pint of as ugly and filthy-looking and foul-smelling deposit as can well be imagined. It was a repulsive conglomeration of decayed vegetable and animal matter, a sight to cause an involuntary shudder to creep over the ordinarily invulnerable constitution of a newspaper man. "This," said the doctor, holding the sickening mass up to the sunlight, "I removed from the bottom of my tank a few days since, and the tank was well cleansed and securely covered over about eight months ago. The entire tank had a soft, slimy lining, and half-suspended near the bottom were coagulated masses of about the consistency of what is familiarly known as the 'mother in vinegar.' Now, with these obvious causes of bad taste," said Dr. Barnes, "what is the use of going to chemistry for an analysis, in view of its repeated failures to satisfy us as to the cause? Let us examine it by other methods. The above being the present condition, let us eliminate the other assigned causes. Sewage has often been suggested as a cause, but sewage is emptied into the supply no more this year than last, or five years ago, and yet, with high and low water, we have had the bad taste; and additionally Cochituate, which received the greatest known quantity through Pegan brook, in Natick,

is the best tasting water. Cochituate was contaminated soon after Sudbury River was turned into it, about two years ago, or before the new conduit was completed, and remained bad until it ceased to receive this water. It has gradually been getting better, until now it is very good. We had good tasting water from the Sudbury River last spring, but this was at a time when the water in the new reservoirs was at the line of clean gravel made by the waves the year before, and very little sediment was washed in. The Water Board state that basin No. 2 has more loam than No. 3, and that it is better tasting now. This is explained by the fact that, whereas No. 3 was nearly exhausted through the warm weather, thereby exposing vast flats to the sun, No. 2 has no flats, and has been kept full most of the time. In one reservoir the waves acted on mud banks, in the other on gravel. Mystic has had a bad taste several times, and several times also have dams been raised and new reservoirs been added. Nine years ago Cochituate had a bad taste, but, about this time, flash boards were said to have been put on the dam, thus overflowing adjacent lands. No trouble followed when Chestnut Hill water was first used, for the simple reason the soil was entirely skinned off, down to the clay, and the wash guarded against by stone lining. The city of Newton has had no trouble, and here also was the reservoir excavated. In regard to Spot Pond trouble, three years ago, Mr. Wilde of the firm of Lawrence & Wilde, one of the Water Board having that pond in charge, states that the year previous to the bad taste the water was very low, exposing muddy flats to a summer's sun. Ice formed the following winter, before these flats were well covered, and the high water in spring lifted with the ice immense fields of mud, which were stirred up in the water, giving it an earthy taste, and that Mr. Wilde was confident this was the cause, and not a malady likely to affect any pond, as suggested by the Water Board of Boston. The late Dr. Jacob Bigelow stated that Sudbury River water would not be good unless the loam was removed, and I have this from no less an authority than Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes. If the Water Board thinks the loam no cause of trouble, why does it propose to remove it in the basin just begun? The fish story is dismissed as unworthy of consideration until the author shows us why Boston monopolizes this eel business periodically, and other cities and towns that have water pipes do not compete. Now, as to the healthfulness of this water. A chemist tells me it is not objectionable, and the complaint is due to the æsthetics of Boston. The Water Board tells us to 'bear it as best we can;

time will correct the trouble,' but, with about 250 cases of typhoid fever already reported to the Board of Health this fall, it is about time we begun to inquire if the health of the city is not affected by this vile water. At any rate, let the Water Board prohibit waste of water through hand hose in the high service, and perhaps there will be enough Cochituate to go round until the Sudbury River basins are filled to the line of clean gravel. To illustrate how little vegetable material is necessary to impregnate water, last evening there were placed in my back yard a few well-seasoned pine boards to create a water-shed, that sufficient rain water might be secured for domestic purposes. In a few moments a large bowl was collected, but it had a very decided taste and odor of pine wood, notwithstanding it only came in contact with the boards while trickling over them."

FISH IN THE PIPES.

INTERESTING PAPER BY DR. TALBOT ON THE CAUSE OF OUR BAD WATER.

At the Homœopathic Hospital on East Concord Street, last evening, before a number of members of the Massachusetts Homœopathic Medical Society, Dr. I. T. Talbot of the Boston University read the following paper giving his theory of the causes of the present impurity of Cochituate water.

The present condition of the water furnished by Boston in its corporate capacity to its citizens is such as may well excite alarm in the community, and especially among physicians, whose highest duty is to protect the people from disease. In this short paper I do not propose to enter upon the difficulties of managing a great system of water supply, but rather to point out certain grave and obvious defects and conditions which can be and which should be immediately removed. Some of these conditions are of recent origin, and others have been gradually increasing during the thirty-three years since the Cochituate water was introduced into Boston.

I. Pegan Brook. It is claimed that the town of Natick has now a right to drain its sewage and filth through Pegan brook into Lake Cochituate, because it has always done so. That the citizens of Boston have for thirty-three years been drinking a constantly increasing amount of this filth from Natick seems most astonishing; that the Water Board, clothed with power to spend millions of dollars on these water works,

should not have found means to remedy this disgusting condition, seems still more strange. If it is a determination on the part of the citizens of Natick to injure the citizens of Boston, which nobody believes, law could certainly set matters right; if it is merely a matter of dollars and cents, Boston should not stand haggling while its people are reaping death from this cause.

2. Sudbury River Basins. But, whatever may be said of the vested rights of sewerage into Pegan brook, certainly nothing can be urged in extenuation of those who, in the construction of these basins, would take fields covered with barnyard manure and vegetable mould and turn water upon them, and when well saturated introduce it into Boston for its citizens to drink.

3. Eels. Few persons are aware of the quantity of eels living and growing in the large water pipes of the city. The nature of this fish is such that it can exist without access to light and air, and the mud and silt in the main pipes afford a favorable ground for propagation and growth. The current is not so rapid as to prevent their free circulation, and there they live for years, and sometimes grow to enormous size. They are not likely to enter the small outlets or supply pipes for houses, and yet we find in the last report of the Boston Water Board that 286 stoppages of these pipes by fish have occurred in the past year. But the enormous number of eels existing in the pipes is shown by the number discharged from any outlet of considerable size. The Standard Sugar Refinery in South Boston uses a large amount of water, which is discharged into a meter through a four-inch pipe. To protect this meter it was necessary to construct an eel-trap, through which the fish could not pass. This trap had to be frequently cleansed, sometimes every day, and seven eels, weighing twenty-five pounds, have been taken as the accumulation of a single day. Some of these are of great size, measuring three feet in length, as large round as a man's wrist, and weighing six and a quarter and six and a half pounds. So troublesome did this matter become, that the Water Board was obliged to construct an eel-trap in the street in connection with the main pipe, and thus prevent their entrance into the four-inch service pipe. If this immense number of eels can infest a four-inch pipe so far distant, there can be no doubt of the condition of the larger mains in other parts of the city. Now, though eels do live to a green old age, there is no doubt that they do finally die and go to decay; and if you will put a good, fat, six-pound decaying eel into a tub of water, you will, in a few days, get precisely such water as the people of

Boston have, from time to time, furnished them. This condition has, by a kind of euphemism, been called a "cucumber taste," but it sometimes has that "ancient and fishlike smell" that would put to shame the vilest of cucumbers. It varies very greatly at different times, depending on whether the dead carcass is before your door or has floated on to your neighbors'. There are epidemics among fish as among other animals, and it would seem as though these *anguillæ* had been recently thus afflicted. The result is offensively brought to our senses, though their perishing carcasses are daily diluted in 26,000,000 gallons of water. For days at a time in various parts of the city one cannot make his morning ablution or use the water for brushing his teeth without producing nausea, and servant girls at the washtub have been sickened even to vomiting. With such facts before them is it not strange that members of the Water Board should profess to be in ignorance of the cause of these impurities? It is well enough to call science to our aid; it is very proper to have correct analyses of the water; but, until the evils of Pegan brook and Sudbury River basins, and dead and decaying eels are remedied, we shall look in vain to science for any good results in this matter.

He added—This matter is one of so much importance to us physicians, and to every one of our patients, as well as to all others in the city, that I submit upon it the following resolutions, which I move that the society should adopt:

Resolved, That the present filthy condition of the aqueduct water in Boston is offensive to the senses and injurious to the health of the inhabitants of this city, and we call upon the Water Board to take immediate measures for its purification; First, by removing, at whatever cost, all the present known and obvious causes of pollution; and second, under the direction of the most capable scientific men, by avoiding, as far as possible, all future sources of impurity.

Resolved, That the City Government be requested, in its highest office of providing for the health and welfare of the citizens, to furnish means for and aid the Water Board in carrying out practical and efficient measures for the purification of the water provided by the city.

In seconding the motion to adopt the resolutions, Dr. Conrad Wesselhoeft said that when the Sudbury River basins were being constructed he had inspected them with some care. For them the masonry was both ornamental and massive, but none of the vegetable mould on their bottoms had been removed. His opinion was that the water has remained in them until it has become an infusion which is nutritious to certain



RESIDENCE, 1 ARLINGTON STREET.

1883 — 1894.

forms of vegetable and animal life, that, if they are not unhealthy, are not pleasant additions to a fluid used for drinking purposes. Whatever might have been the cause he had seen under the microscope in filtrations from Cochituate water dozens of different algæ and crustacea and articulata; he had no doubt that a more thorough examination on his part would have disclosed myriads of other forms of like character. He was strongly in favor of giving definite form to a demand for better water for the people of this city.

Dr. Loring desired to know why it is that there is such difference in the taste of the water in different localities, as at the Highlands she had found it sweet, and on Columbus Avenue she had found it offensive both to smell and taste.

Dr. Talbot, in reply, said, the condition of "don't know" into which the Water Board has worked itself is simply marvellous. When he was in its room in the City Hall, a short time ago, one of its members had shown him two glasses of water—one drawn in the basement of the building and very offensive, the other taken from a pipe in the top of the same structure, and sweet both to smell and taste—and asked him, "How do you account for the difference?" To him it seemed so obvious that he wondered any one who had given the subject any thought should ask such a question. It is well known that water—especially water in motion—has a tendency to purify itself. That which supplies the Highlands and the upper stories of the lofty buildings in all parts of the city is so pumped that no eels or other objects of perceptible size can pass through the suction pipe; then it is sent on a long course through pipes into which there is no entrance save that through which it comes. If it were foul when first pumped it would soon begin to lose its offensive properties and ere long it would be sweet to taste and smell and apparently pure.

Dr. Woodvine, Dr. Clark, Dr. Sherman, Dr. Farnsworth and others spoke in favor of the adoption of the resolutions, after which they were adopted by a unanimous vote.

Dr. Farnsworth of Cambridge called attention to the difficulty of convincing the State Board of Health of the existence of a nuisance, of which he had seen an instance in the movement against the pollution of Miller's River. In that contest he said the people of Cambridge—of East Cambridge particularly—had had arrayed against them the influence of the Boston & Albany Railroad Company and that of the Cunard Steamship Company, which had so nearly blinded the Board that it was almost impossible to convince it that there was any nuisance at all. To do any

good, the source of difficulty must be pointed out to that official board whose duty it is to deal with it.

Dr. Talbot remarked that when there were 1,900 cases of smallpox at one time in Boston nine years ago, the Board of Aldermen, which had charge of the city's health, covered the real condition of things up and evaded action for the abatement of the epidemic until it was forced by popular opinion, emphatically expressed, to do what it should have done. He felt that in the matter of the purity of the city's water supply, nothing would be done until the City Council is compelled by an exact statement of facts to abate a nuisance of which every one has a right and ought to complain.

Dr. Sherman moved that a committee be appointed to investigate the sources of the water supply, ascertain the cause of impurities and report thereon to the society. This motion having been acted upon affirmatively, Drs. Conrad Wesselhoeft, Woodvine and I. T. Talbot were appointed to perform the duties designated by it.

The following appeared in one of the daily papers:

THE IMPURE WATER.

At a meeting, last evening, the Massachusetts Homœopathic Medical Society declared the "aqueduct water in Boston offensive to the senses and injurious to the health of the inhabitants of this city;" called upon the Water Board "to take immediate measures for its purification," and requested the City Government to provide the means for so doing. Dr. I. T. Talbot, who is well known to our community, imputes the noxious condition to three causes, viz.: the sewage of Natick; the foulness included in the Sudbury River basins; and the presence of large numbers of eels, living and dead, in the pipes. Dr. Talbot's general description of the polluting elements is not calculated to commend the Cochituate as a beverage. It suggests an almost inconceivable amount of incapacity on the part of those intrusted with the water supply of Boston. It points out the line in which something should be speedily done to ward off evils of alarming proportions to the city. Cost ought not to be brought into account, or held as only a minor consideration, when competent medical men give their deliberate opinion that the water of Boston is "injurious to the health of the inhabitants." The most pressing duty upon the City Government is to provide a liquid that can be drunk and used with safety. The Executive of the city should exert whatever offi-

cial influence he has to infuse, if possible, into the proper department an appreciation of the exigency.

Another paper had the following:

OUR WATER SUPPLY.

The question of pure water and plenty of it for the city of Boston is one of paramount importance to our citizens. The query who shall be the next mayor, the matter of public parks, and all other important issues, pale into insignificance before the necessity of an ample supply of pure water.

We are not disposed to harshly and unfairly criticise the present or past members of the Water Board because of the state of affairs which now exists. We really think, however, that all the people will agree with us that the members of the present Water Board do not act as if they were facing a great emergency in our history. While many citizens are suggesting theories, and endeavoring to find causes to be removed, the Water Board simply confines itself to rejecting all propositions and calmly calling the attention of the public to the vast ignorance of all who attempt to enlighten the people. Here is a state of things which the timely ounce of prevention would have made the pound or ton of cure unnecessary. The bad taste and the horrible stench came, and we are coolly informed that it is all right; it has been so before, it has passed away, and the water has again tasted pure and has again smelt sweet. And on the principle that we never have had a storm which has not passed over, this taste and stench will leave us some time.

Our theory of a Water Board is that it is intended to see not only that we have an ample supply of water and to guard against a possible scarcity, but also to prevent impurities. The Board maintains a masterly inactivity, but still kindly permits the Committee on Water Supply of the City Government to hire an able gentleman from Baltimore, and Boston people must drink and bathe in the dirty liquid now furnished until it is found out what he thinks. This is perhaps commendable, but analysis has been tried many times at similar periods of impurity in years gone by, and nothing definite could be obtained. We hear that the Baltimore gentleman is personally inspecting the brooks, ponds and basins, and he may learn something in that way which will be more useful than any analysis he can make. Why the members of the Board, with the engineering and investigating skill at their command, have not the information in their possession we are not informed and cannot understand.

We believe the Water Board should act, and act at once, and we are ready to aid them to the extent of our power. If they are not equal to the emergency, they should be at once removed and more active and more competent men put in their places. Anybody can be a member of the Water Board in ordinary times. Emergencies are what test men, not sunshine and pleasant weather. Here is a grave emergency, and we hope the Water Board will be equal to it.—*Boston Globe*.

PURE WATER.

There is no municipal question at all comparable in importance to that of procuring a supply of healthful and palatable water for the use of the mass of our population. The City Government has generally recognized this fact. It can proceed with confidence upon the assurance that the people will willingly tax themselves for an object with which the health and welfare of the metropolis are so inseparably connected. Expenditures to promote cleanliness and a free use of nature's beverage, unpolluted, are properly regarded as the wisest of investments. An indebtedness of thirteen millions of dollars attests the judgment of the city in favor of liberal outlays for a water supply. But what sort of a supply have we got at present? It is one that for the most part cannot be used without boiling, that none would think of drinking unless rendered almost insane by thirst, and which, when applied for washing or bathing purposes, leaves an aroma and a stickiness more suggestive of filth than conducive to right sanitary conditions. Large numbers of families ceased, several weeks ago, to drink the vile stuff, and besides paying water rates, purchase of private individuals what is necessary for household consumption.

This is not a matter to be trifled with by the City Government, or set aside for schemes that can wait. Temperance, purity, health, all demand instant and energetic action, so that the community shall be relieved from a nuisance which will engender disease and death. Whatever the cost, whether it be five, twenty-five or forty millions, our citizens must have pure water.

There has been such a "forcible-feeble" management of the subject, such a procrastinating policy, which sometimes springs from a conscious lack of capacity, that a feeling of distrust is becoming widespread among the public that the magnitude of the problem has dazed those charged with its solution. Yet, after all, facts daily come to light with respect

to the contamination of the water easily accounting, in the judgment of many common-sense minds, for the noxious taste and smell. If this be so, purification is only a question of expense. If there be no way of purifying, then a new supply is a necessity. And the people, who are forced to imbibe a fluid offensive and impure, have a right to protest against further delay in deciding the point. Paramount to any other cause claiming the attention of the city authorities is that of a proper water supply. The City Council should never lose sight of the fact in its bearing upon municipal expenditure.

An exigency is undoubtedly upon us on the question of water. It might never have occurred had a greater amount of energy been displayed in that particular department of the Municipal Government. But the department may have been hampered by the inertia of the City Council, its refusal to make appropriations deemed indispensable by the Water Board. However this is, something has now got to be done immediately. Consumers will not longer consent to be taxed by the city for water they cannot drink or employ in hardly any household service.

The Boston *Transcript* contained the following:

WATER PHENOMENA.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

Reading continually of the great agitation because of the alleged impurity of the water, we are surprised and perplexed that nothing seems to trouble the transparency and tastelessness of that which flows into our house. We are on a quiet street leading from Columbus Avenue, and of course the supply must be from the same source.

Ever since our return from the country (Oct. 1) we have desired nothing purer than the water from Cochituate, which we constantly use. Can any one explain our immunity from the almost universal affliction?

J. R.

THE WATER SUPPLY.

The Board of Health have been impelled by the condition of the water furnished by the city works to make a special and personal investigation of the condition of the basins to-day. It is likely enough that nothing will be found out at this investigation any more than at the scores of investigations by all sorts of persons that have preceded it. Nevertheless it was clearly the duty of the Board to try to do something.

as it is clearly the duty of the press and the public to clamor for relief until something is done. As the Health Board says in its last report, "Whether the influence of such water be healthy or unhealthy; whether it arises from an unprepared water basin or the low state of the lake; whether the remedy costs little or much—the people of Boston feel dissatisfied with the result, and are willing to pay the cost of clean, inoffensive and wholesome water." The "great annoyance and expense brought to our citizens by this most disgusting condition of the drinking water" are recognized by the Board and there is some consolation in that. "It is not enough," they continue, "to know that the water reaches us in a passable condition; that the chemist fails to find the evidences of the sewer or cesspool contamination in the water when it reaches us; or that there is no epidemic or typhoid fever, dysentery, or other decided manifestation of a polluted drinking water. We should know that the streams which flow into such lakes and reservoirs are absolutely uncontaminated." Herein the Board of Health differs from the Water Board, at least so far as the attitude of the latter hitherto has presented itself to the public. To-day the Water Board in a published card adopts a somewhat different and more helpful position. It is unnecessary to promise on the part of those who are paying about as much for water to drink as for sugar or milk, and whose household expenses are daily augmented by so much, that they will co-operate faithfully with the proposed endeavors toward relief which the Water Board has at last undertaken.

In the *Transcript* of Nov. 10, 1881, is the following article:

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

The act for supplying the city of Boston with pure (?) water passed the Legislature March 25, 1845, and was accepted by the city on the 13th of April of the year following. The water was introduced into Boston and the event celebrated Oct. 25, 1848. Passing over the appointment and duties of commissioners during the construction of the works, we come down to Oct. 31, 1850, when the Cochituate Water Board was established. By the city ordinance passed at that time it was to be chosen annually, by concurrent vote of the two branches of the City Council, and consist of one alderman, one member of the Common Council, and five citizens at large; no person to be chosen as aforesaid for more than five consecutive years. By the ordinance of Sept. 7, 1869, it was provided that one alderman and two councilmen should be annually

elected to the Board to serve during the municipal year, and that two citizens at large, to serve two years, should be concurrently chosen by the City Council and to serve for two years.

By act of the Legislature of 1875 the Cochituate Water Board was abolished (also the Mystic Water Board, Charlestown having been annexed to Boston by statute of 1873), and by city ordinance of March 22, 1876, the present Boston Water Board was established. By this ordinance it was provided that the three members of the Board should, in the month of April, 1876, be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the City Council's approval, one member to serve for one year, one for two years and one for three years; their successors to be appointed for three years, one member each year. The ordinance says, "Any member of said Board may at any time be removed by the Mayor, with the consent of the City Council, or he may be removed by vote of two-thirds of the whole of each branch of the City Council by vote taken by yea and nay." The members of the Board were required to "devote their time to the duties of their office," and prohibited from actively engaging in any other business. They are paid \$3,000 per annum. In prescribing the powers and duties of the Board, the ordinance reads, "The said Board . . . shall have and exercise all the powers, so far as the same can be legally delegated by the City Council, which are granted to the city of Boston by chapter 167 of the acts of the year 1846, entitled 'An act for supplying the city of Boston with pure water,' and by any acts in addition thereto; also all the powers granted to the city of Boston by chapter 177 of the acts of the year 1872, entitled 'An act to authorize the city of Boston to obtain an additional supply of pure water;' also all powers now held by the city of Boston under the provisions of chapter 105 of the acts of the year 1861, entitled 'An act to supply the city of Charlestown with pure water,' and any acts in addition thereto; subject, however, to the authority of the City Council from time to time by ordinances, or resolutions to instruct said Board, and to change and limit its powers; and said Board shall have power to appoint such subordinate officers, agents and assistants, in addition to the engineer and water registrar elected by the City Council, as it may deem necessary, and may fix their compensation; provided, that the expenditures incurred by it shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum previously appropriated or authorized by the City Council for the care, maintenance, repair, or enlargement of the water works." The city engineer, as engineer of the Board, and the water registrar, are both under the direction of the Boston Water Board. Under this ordinance

the present Board was organized July 31, 1876. The first appointees were Timothy T. Sawyer, Leonard R. Cutter and Albert Stanwood. The latter two have held office up to the present time. Mr. Sawyer failed to receive a reappointment in 1879, and Mr. Francis Thompson, formerly of the Mystic Board, was appointed in his place by Mayor Prince. Mr. Thompson's term is the first to expire, in May next.

It will be seen by the quotations given from the ordinance establishing it, that the Water Board, subject to the City Council's approval, has full control of the works, of the engineers engaged in their construction and management, and of scientific experts or others employed to trace out causes and sources of pollution. It furthermore appears that the members are at any time removable for cause by the Mayor, the Council consenting.

At this time the Water Board spoke for itself through the columns of the daily press as follows:

BOSTON'S WATER.

A COMMUNICATION FROM THE WATER BOARD ON THE SUBJECT.

To the Citizens of Boston:

The Water Board has submitted heretofore, without reply, to the unfavorable criticisms of the public and the press in regard to its responsibility for the present bad taste in the water supply, confident that the report of the eminent expert at present employed in the investigation of the matter would exonerate it from charges of inefficiency or neglect of any precautions which could be taken to prevent the evil. But while the Board deeply regrets that the citizens should be subjected to such a nauseous annoyance, so far entirely beyond the power of the Board to remedy, it believes that the following statement of a few facts in relation to the matter is due to itself, and will also show that several of the theories which have been advanced as to the cause of the bad taste and odor of the water are untenable in the light of past history. The "fishy" or "cucumber" taste first appeared in Lake Cochituate in 1854, six years after the introduction of the water, and was then, as it has been several times since, carefully investigated by the best experts that could be obtained. At that time Prof. E. N. Horsford and Dr. Charles T. Jackson each made an exhaustive examination of the matter, and a careful inquiry was also made to ascertain if other sources of water supply had been

similarly affected. The investigations of Professor Horsford and Dr. Jackson were not conclusive as to the cause of the evil, but Dr. Jackson, in closing his report, said, "I regret as much as any one that we have not been able to settle all the interesting questions that have arisen as to the origin of the impurity complained of. This much we have done. We have proved that the peculiar taste of the water does not originate within the pipes, but exists at the fountain head, and that it is not the result of animal putrefaction but of vegetable fermentation, and that there is nothing deleterious in the water. These are some points gained. In time we may search out the other matters should the evil again recur."

The result of the inquiries of the Water Board as to whether other lakes and pond had been similarly affected showed that the difficulty had not been confined to Lake Cochituate. Round Pond, near Haverhill, and the then source of supply for that place, Rensselaer Lake, the then source of supply for Albany, N. Y., Jamaica Pond, Chicopee River, and several wells near Lake Cochituate and at other places were found to have been similarly affected. In 1855, this peculiar taste was again found to exist in some portions of the lake, but it did not become a source of serious annoyance. So far as the records show, there was no recurrence of this offensive taste to an objectionable extent until 1875. In that year it appeared first in the pipes and then in the Bradlee Basin of the Chestnut Hill Reservoir. This basin was immediately isolated, and although five months elapsed before it regained its normal taste, no other portion of the water supply was affected. Prof. William Ripley Nichols, Dr. W. S. Farlow and Mr. Edward Burgess, thorough experts in their several scientific specialties, were employed to investigate the water supply and ascertain, if possible, the cause of the impurity which existed in the Bradlee Basin. Their reports are of such recent date that it is unnecessary to do more than refer to them for details, as they were published in the annual report of the Water Board for 1875. The result of their investigations may, however, be briefly stated by the following extracts from Professor Nichols's report: "I must frankly confess that as yet I am quite in the dark as to the cause of the trouble, although I have made a careful examination of the circumstances which would seem able to throw any light on the subject. Various theories have been proposed to account for the occurrence, most of which are untenable. It may be well to allude to some of them and to point out the bearing of our observations upon them. I may say, however, what is well known to those who have professionally to do with the water supply of cities, that many reservoirs,

perhaps most reservoirs of considerable size, are liable, at times, to be affected in some way, by which the water, for a longer or shorter period, is rendered unpleasant and sometimes absolutely unfit for use." . . . "As there is yet no certainty as to the cause of the trouble, it is not, of course, possible to suggest any means either of prevention or cure. There is no proof that the water would be actually injurious to a healthy person, although it was certainly very unpalatable. In January of the present year the peculiar taste again appeared and was located in Lake Cochituate. There was at that time an ample quantity in the Sudbury basins and river, and the lake was therefore cut off from the supply and was not again used until July 14, when the disagreeable taste had disappeared. At the present time, the bad taste is confined to the waters of Farm Pond, where it probably originated, and the Chestnut Hill Reservoir, which has undoubtedly been contaminated by the Farm Pond water running through it. It does not exist in any of the Sudbury basins, and is imperceptible in Lake Cochituate. If there was an ample supply of water on hand it would not probably be a difficult matter to remedy the evil, but, with the present scarcity, measures which could otherwise be taken are impracticable. The Board has, however, after consultation with the city engineer, who is also the general superintendent of the water works, under its direction, given that official the power to use the various sources of water supply in such a manner as he may deem best for the purpose of attempting a remedy, or, at least, an alleviation, of the present evil. It will be necessary for the citizens to use every precaution to prevent waste of water, and to avoid any unnecessary use of the same for five or six days, commencing on Tuesday morning, Nov. 15; and in order that all the water takers may have an adequate supply during the temporary reduction of the quantity furnished, the Board appeals to all the citizens to aid it in this experiment, by reducing their consumption of water to the lowest practicable limit, and that this consumption can be reduced, so that all the citizens can have a supply of good water, is evident from the fact that the present quantity used averages one hundred gallons per head of population in the districts supplied from the Sudbury and Cochituate works, while it is less than seventy gallons in the district supplied by the Mystic. In conclusion, neither the sewage, dead fish, dead leaves, loam nor any other theory which has yet been advanced is sufficient, in the opinion of scientific experts, to account for all the phases of this peculiar taste of the water; the citizens ought not therefore, we think, to be so unjust as to blame the Board for an evil, a cause or cure

for which the best scientific experts have been unable to ascertain, after the most careful investigation. If the examination now being made by Professor Remsen should lead that gentleman to believe that he has ascertained the cause of the evil complained of, citizens may rest assured that the Board will take every measure to prevent a recurrence of the trouble.

For the Boston Water Board,

LEONARD R. CUTTER, Chairman.

Recently the water supply of Baltimore, Md., has been similarly affected, and, three years since, Spot Pond, the supply for Malden and Medford, had the same bad taste.

In the sixth annual report of the Water Board, for 1882, is the following:

"The Board are unable to contemplate the capacity of the works with the same amount of satisfaction, and a large portion of their report will be given to requests for the enlargement of the high service and the further development of the Sudbury River system. Even if the present enormous consumption of water is successfully checked by a meter system, it would still, in the opinion of the Board, be the part of a wise foresight to begin the construction of the works.

"During the past year a number of the claims still remaining unsettled on the Sudbury works have been disposed of, and several alterations have been made in the water rates. An attempt has been made to treat the sewage of the Mystic sewer in accordance with the act to abate a nuisance in the lower Mystic pond; and the construction of a new storage basin on the Sudbury River has been begun.

"An application made to the Legislature at its last session to secure the waters of the Shawsheen River was unsuccessful. It is important that this matter be urged at the next session of the General Court.

The average daily consumption of water for the year 1881, including the Mystic works, was 38,214,900 gallons, an increase of 6.5 per cent over the consumption for 1880. This amount is equivalent to an average daily consumption of 92 gallons per head of population.

"This steady increase in the consumption of water presents one of the most serious problems which those in charge of the management of water works have to meet. Over and above the question of waste there are no data more certain, in view of the experience of the past, than those which point to the ever-increasing extensions of existing works

with the necessarily increasing number of takers and the constantly increasing uses which are found for the consumption of water.

"Although the Board have often urged upon the City Council for a number of successive years the importance of extending the works in certain directions in time to meet the demands made upon them, it has been the practice in the past to provide the funds for increasing the capacity of the works only when the emergency was most strongly felt by the actual necessities and demands of the consumers. In the opinion of the Board this policy results in great wrong to the consumer. As a general rule the construction of important additions to a water supply includes the loss of several working seasons. This is seldom taken into account, and, in consequence, if the works happen to be storage reservoirs, their water has to be hurried into the city, to prevent an actual scarcity of supply, long before it is in a fit condition to be used. Then, again, the basins have to be drawn down to such an extent in the summer that a large part of the bottom is exposed, and the water in the lower portion is generally of an inferior quality to that nearer the surface.

"Two years ago the Board urged upon the City Council the importance of taking 'immediate steps towards the construction of an additional basin.' It was not until August, 1881, that the necessary authority was granted for the construction of what is to be known as Basin No. 4 of the Sudbury system. Work was at once begun; but, with every means taken to facilitate construction, it will be hardly possible to fill this new basin till 1884. It is now evident to the Board that work on another new basin should be begun at once, and they accordingly ask for authority to undertake the preliminary work of making the surveys and securing the land.

"The increase in consumption in the territory supplied by the Highland high service works has been two and one-half per cent over the consumption of the preceding year; but for the last few months it has been increasing at a much greater rate than this; and the present indications are that, for the coming year, the increase will exceed ten per cent.

"The enlargement of the present high-service system cannot be longer delayed with any degree of safety.

"To reduce the extravagant use of water to more reasonable limits has been the constant study of the Board. They have favored the more extended use of meters, and during the past year many new ones have been applied. There are, however, difficulties in the way of an entire application of a meter system at once to a city like Boston. During

the past year an investigation of this subject has been made by the Joint Standing Committee on Water, and from their report it will be seen that, if the present consumption could be reduced to sixty gallons per head, the capacity of the works would be sufficient for many years.

"Sudbury River has supplied to the city 9,036,700,000 gallons, equivalent to an average daily supply of over 24,758,100 gallons. Almost all of this water was run directly to the city without passing through Lake Cochituate. The storage-basins were all full at the beginning of the year. Basin No. 1 has been used principally during the past drought in supplying the one and a half million gallons daily which the Board are required to pass into Sudbury River below their dams. Its water has not been of very good quality, owing to the presence of algæ.

"Basin No. 2, which was full on May 1, 1881, was emptied by the latter end of July; but as this basin soon fills from rains, it has been drawn upon at different times during the entire year, and has formed the principal reliance of the city. A few improvements have been made around its margin.

"Basin No. 3 was used principally during August and September to re-enforce the supply. Algæ made their appearance, as usual, in its waters early in the year, principally on the surface, but later they were more uniformly distributed through the water. While the basin was low a considerable amount of loam and stumps was removed in the vicinity of the gatehouse.

"The quality of the water in Sudbury River has been generally good throughout the year. During the month of October, however, a very disagreeable taste developed in the water of Farm Pond, which, as the works are now arranged, forms a link in the Sudbury River supply. As all the water from this source had to be passed through Farm Pond, all the water became tainted. It had a fishy or cucumber taste, and awakened a widespread excitement in the city. Professor Remsen of Baltimore was chosen by the Joint Standing Committee on Water to make an investigation of the cause of the bad taste, which he ascribed to the *Spongilla fluviatilis*, a fresh-water sponge, or low form of animal life. Whatever the cause, it became apparent that decided steps would have to be taken to correct the evil. Under the advice and direction of the city engineer, Farm Pond was lowered to grade 142.17, seven feet below high-water mark, and a temporary ditch or canal, a mile in length, was built around the westerly margin, to convey the Sudbury water direct to the aqueduct. This work was done at considerable expense, but after its

completion no further trouble was experienced in the city from the bad taste."

Mr. Wightman in his engineer's report writes as to quality:

"As in former years the quality of the water from the Sudbury and Cochituate works has been at times objectionable. Algæ have been developed during the summer in large quantities in the waters of Reservoirs 1 and 3, and Farm Pond, and to a lesser extent in Lake Cochituate.

"In Reservoir 2 but few of these vegetable growths have been noticed. The fishy or cucumber taste to which the water supply has been subject in former years, and which has usually been located in Lake Cochituate, appeared the past year not only in the lake, but also in Farm Pond.

"Fortunately this bad taste was not present in both sources at the same time. Prof. Ira Remsen of Baltimore was employed to make an investigation, for the purpose of determining, if possible, the cause for this obnoxious condition of the water in Farm Pond. The result of his investigation, the details of which are given in his report to the Joint Special Committee on Water, was the tracing of the bad taste to the presence in the pond of quantities of the fresh-water sponge, *Spongilla Lacustius*. The conditions which are favorable for the growth of this low order of animal life are not sufficiently well known to scientists to enable them to suggest any precautions which can be taken to prevent its development. It is probable that it exists in portions of our water supply which have not been affected by the extremely objectionable taste it at times produces.

"Specimens have been found in Reservoir 1, and a careful examination would, perhaps, show that it inhabits the other reservoirs. As there is no method of eradicating the sponge except by drawing off the water from the reservoir in which it appears, and then collecting and destroying it, the water supply must, until scientists know more of its habits, be subject, periodically, to contamination from it. The condition of the supply, as regards quantity, will seldom permit the reservoirs to be emptied, even if they contain bad water, and in the case of Lake Cochituate it is impossible. The only remedy is the isolation, when practicable, of the reservoirs or portion of the supply which is contaminated, from the source from which the city is being supplied.

"The Mystic water has been unusually good the past year. The algæ, which have in former years rendered it at times objectionable, did not appear to any extent. The removal by the Mystic Valley Sewer of the sewage from the tanneries, which formerly polluted this source, has

been the most important factor in the improvement of the quality of the water."

During this year Mr. Hiram Cutts takes Mr. Charles H. Bigelow's place as Superintendent of Mystic Department.

The seventh annual report, for the year ending April 30, 1883, is signed by William A. Simmons, chairman, George M. Hobbs, John G. Blake.

Mayor Palmer, after considerable hesitancy, turned out the former Water Board, for they would none of them accept his invitation to resign, and put in above mentioned.

During the fall of 1882 the following interview and letter were published; also the items following:

AN ISSUE AT LAST.

Raking the offices of City Hall from top to bottom, the managers of the Democratic City Committee's annual raid for the spoils thereof have been unable to find anything capable of being magnified into an "issue," save the bad water in the city's basins and reservoirs. That the water is not so good as it might be, or as it ought to be, we suppose will be admitted without contest. Indeed, Dr. Green himself presumably agrees with the spirit of the action of the organization of medical men of which he is himself a prominent and respected member—Suffolk District Branch of the Massachusetts Medical Society, which voted to express to the Water Commission now investigating the water supply the hope that it would not adjourn without a thorough and careful consideration of the whole question of the city's water supply, nor without making some suggestion for future action in the premises which may offer a reasonable hope of providing pure water. The *Medical and Surgical Journal*, in recording this action, stated that it was evidently the opinion of the physicians of Boston "that a water saturated with so large an amount of decaying vegetable matter may easily encourage indirectly a variety of digestive derangements, especially in those otherwise in feeble health;" and the journal added that the water had certainly been better since the commission has been sitting, and, though it evidently could not see how, it hoped "that the assiduous attendance of the Water Board upon the sittings of the commission will be blessed to the community in due time and shape."

Mayor Green, being a doctor, may be presumed to share these senti-

ments of his fellow physicians. But he has not left the matter to be the subject of surmise. To the Water Board, whose "assiduous attendance upon the sittings of the commission" the *Medical Journal* hopes will be blessed to the community, and to whose sins of omission and commission are generally charged the evils of which the water takers complain. Mayor Green has appointed but one of the three members, Mr. Timothy T. Sawyer. Mr. Cutter is a legacy of the Prince administration, and was reappointed at the very end of Mr. Prince's term, after the well-known objections to him had been fully made known and discussed in the newspapers. His reappointment under the circumstances had all the appearance of being the "vindication" of an official "under fire," and the appointment was undoubtedly so intended and accepted. Let the Democratic City Committee proceed then to disinter this sin of the Prince régime if it thinks best. Mayor Green has no responsibility for it or connection with it, except the appointment of an able commission to investigate Mr. Cutter's Board. This commission is composed of Alderman Joseph Caldwell, chairman of the Committee on Water; Malcolm S. Greenough, chairman of the same committee on the part of the Common Council; Nathaniel J. Bradlee, who, as a former member of the City Government, took considerable interest in the water question; Dr. John G. Blake, a well-known physician; and Harvey N. Shepard, formerly president of the Common Council, and who has made a study of the subject. Evidently this is an investigating committee that will investigate. It is hard to see what more Mayor Green could have done or can do about the water or the Water Board until this commission reports.

THE WATER BOARD.

To the Editor of the Transcript:

In an editorial article on Saturday, you say that Mr. Cutter of the Water Board "is a legacy of Mayor Prince's administration." He was appointed Water Commissioner by Mayor Cobb, on the organization of the Board in July, 1876, for two years, and after considerable discussion and opposition was confirmed. He was reappointed by Mayor Henry L. Pierce in 1878 for three years, and again confirmed after a hard fight. He was reappointed by Mayor Prince in 1881, and was again confirmed. You should have said that he was a legacy handed down to us by Mayors Cobb, Pierce and Prince, and is the poorest investment that Boston ever made. To make good the blunders of Commissioner Cutter will cost the

city of Boston at least \$200,000. To him we are indebted more than to all other influences combined for the poor condition of our water since he has been a member of the Board. It appears to me you ought to mention these facts, and not put so heavy a load on the back of Mayor Prince, who is not in the present fight.

FAIR PLAY.

[Mr. Cutter was appointed commissioner at the organization of the Water Board probably because of belief in his economical tendencies, and on account of the creditable habit he has of attending to public business when he undertakes it. For that reason he was reappointed by Mayor Henry L. Pierce. Mayor Prince's reasons for reappointing Mr. Cutter were rather political than otherwise, as it is supposed. Mr. Cutter might perform the duties of the Water Board in ordinary times very satisfactorily. If there has been failure on his part to do what was required during the contamination of the water supply, censure for his shortcomings in that respect cannot be carried back any farther than the Prince administration.]

THE CONDITION OF THE WATER SUPPLY.

At a hearing before the committee on water at City Hall yesterday, upon the petition that an investigation be made by the Board of Health into the causes of the continued impurity of Cochituate water, Dr. Henry J. Barnes appeared for the petitioners, and argued that the admitted facts were all that it was necessary to urge in support of the petition. The water is unfit for use and had been almost continually for two years. Everybody knows it, and the efforts of the Water Board to find a remedy have been futile. Every one possessed of the means has for months bought water for drinking purposes, and the successful trade daily carried on in the sidewalk sale of spring water was a disgrace to the city. It has become, he thought, high time for a radical move in a new direction.

Chairman Cutter of the Board asserted that the water supply of Boston is at the present time equal in quality to that of any city in the country. The water is not injurious to health or particularly disagreeable in taste or appearance. The cost of cleaning and concreting the bottoms of the great basins is roughly estimated at \$2,000,000, and the people can have that improvement if they are willing to pay for it. It was further urged in behalf of the Board that much of the present agitation against the quality of the water supply was made without reason, in behalf of

dealers in various spring waters; that the trouble was for the most part imaginary, and that if the facts were clearly presented to the people there would be no further complaint.

Dr. Durgin, chairman of the Board of Health, being asked his views on the subject, said he did not believe the exigency demanded a reference of the matter to the Board of Health. Personally he shared the widespread dissatisfaction over the quality of the water supply. If the water is really as good as the Water Board claims, the only way to make the public believe it is to have all the facts plainly presented by a committee of scientific men in whom every one will have confidence. In any event the City Council should at once make a radical move to restore public confidence, if the water is good enough, or to improve it if it is not what it should be. The committee took the subject under advisement.

Mr. Leonard R. Cutter, who has been Chairman of the Water Board for several years, and has been connected with the department since 1871, received a *Herald* representative at his private office at 67 Leverett Street in the course of the forenoon.

"The Water Board," he said, "has endeavored to do its duty by the citizens of Boston. Personally, I have always acted in a manner to maintain my own self-respect, and am not exercised at whatever derogatory remarks those opposed to me may have made. The department has done everything in its power to give Boston good water and plenty of it. But there are natural causes and other things beyond our control, and as a result there has at times been much complaint about the quality of the supply."

"What in brief, Mr. Cutter, is the position of the Board as regards the bad water, and what are its measures of remedy for the same?"

"It is simply this, to construct several more water basins in the Sudbury River watershed, thereby completing the original system of seven basins, and to have all basins so connected with the main pipes that any of them may be shut off without interfering with the others. When the water in a basin becomes bad, and this will happen occasionally from natural causes, which it is next to impossible to obviate, why, shut it off altogether, until nature adjusts herself and the water becomes drinkable again. My experience has taught me that this is the only way whereby good water at all times may be insured. The Board has repeatedly recommended this course."

"Such a system, I presume, would supply an abundance of water."

"It would; and here is another very strong reason for its adoption.

It would do away with all necessity for the general introduction of water meters. I don't know that it is well for me to criticise the motives that may have influenced the water committee and the City Council in their action, but I am inclined to think that there is a cat in this meal, so to speak. Last night a gentleman came to me and said: 'Do you know that the water meter companies are at the bottom of this whole matter?' Let a Water Board be appointed that is under the control of these companies, and there will be a boom in the meter stock. How much of this cry about the waste of water arises from interested quarters is a question that may well be considered. The profits of a general introduction of meters would be immense. The expense to the community would be immense, too, and, in addition to the cost of introduction, would be the cost of repairs and removals, say after five years. The construction of the original basins would, in my opinion, be very much cheaper and more satisfactory to the users of water and the taxpayers. What meters the Water Board has used and is using for large establishments have been accepted only after a thorough testing of their merits. Most water meters, I may say here, are not worth the cost of the material of which they are made."

"The present Water Board," continued Mr. Cutter, "has had very little to do with the City Council or the water committee. We have not been invited to the hearings, nor have we been consulted in regard to anything except the matter of appropriations for the ensuing year. We have not courted favor by giving the councilmen spreads at the city's expense, as has sometimes been done in times back. Indeed, it would appear that our economy has been one of the chief causes of complaint.

"As far as the salary of the position is concerned," said Mr. Cutter in conclusion, "it is not much object to me. I have my own property to take care of, and can make more money outside of the Water Board than I can in it."

The following letter sent to the *Transcript* on August 26, 1882, by Mr. Cutter will speak for itself:

To the Editor of the Transcript:

My attention has been called to a leading article in your issue of the 12th instant, in which my name has been so freely used and in such an unfair manner that I feel called upon to break my usual rule, and defend myself from misrepresentation. I do this with no vindictive feeling, knowing that there have been many false statements published in the

papers from irresponsible sources, in regard to the water supply and my connection with the management, which I have never deemed worthy of notice, but which may have had some influence with persons unfamiliar with the facts.

You say among other things that—

“The cost of clearing the basins of the rich meadow muck and loam, which City Engineer Davis informed Mr. Cutter and the Water Board would cause precisely the evils arising from its decomposition that have occurred, was estimated at about \$40,000. To Mr. Cutter is attributed the rejection of this item in the appropriation called for by the engineer, he having labored personally with the Council for its defeat.”

Mr. Davis’s original report on the construction of the Sudbury works was made in January, 1873. In this report, on the question of the removal of the soil from the sites of the basins, Mr. Davis says (City Doc. No. 29, page 35):

“No. 3 includes within its boundary an extensive swamp, now covered with a heavy growth of wood, and they all flow large tracts of meadow land supporting a rich vegetation which it is desirable to have removed by grubbing and excavation, as it will otherwise have to be gotten rid of by gradual decomposition. The cost of this class of work will, however, be so great as to limit its application to small areas where the most benefit will be produced, such as that in the upper part of Basin No. 2. The vegetable matter upon other tracts must await the slower process of chemical change, in undergoing which it will be apt at first (especially in the summer months) to deteriorate the water.

“This action will in part or wholly cease after a while, and the basins will slowly assume the character of natural ponds and lakes. As it is desirable that such conditions shall prevail before the city is largely dependent upon the Sudbury water for its supply, it is important that the construction of the basins be commenced at an early day. It will probably require three seasons, at the best, to put them in readiness for use.”

And on page 42:

“One reason why construction should be begun at an early day has already been given, namely, to give time for the storage basins to decompose the vegetable matter that will be overflowed, and produce for themselves conditions similar to those of a natural lake before there is a large demand upon the Sudbury as an aid to the supply.”

These are all the extracts on this subject to be found in this report.

Owing to the lack of appropriations three working seasons were lost,

and it was not until 1876 that active work was begun on construction. During the winter of 1878-9 the basins were practically completed and filled with water for the supply of the city.

While the Water Board were responsible for the way in which the construction was carried on, the actual work was almost entirely in the hands of the engineer, in whom the Board had every confidence. All his recommendations were carried out after proper investigation by the Board, who were in almost daily consultation with him. The more important of his communications were generally made in writing, and answered by formal vote of the Board. Now, if Mr. Davis entertained the opinion which is so generally ascribed to him, why is it that during the whole period of the construction of these works no recommendations were made by the engineer for the removal of the loam? As a matter of fact, this measure was always treated as one to be acted upon when the necessity for the removal should manifest itself, and this necessity has not arisen, as I shall prove.

It is true that during construction large areas of shallow places were deepened on the recommendation of the engineer, and at considerable expense, principally in Basin 1, but this was urged and executed on the score of providing deeper flowage.

Basin 1 was first filled in January, 1879, Basin 2 in August, 1879, and Basin 3 in December, 1878. The question of the removal of the loam first came up on April 24, 1879, in the form of an item *inserted in the appropriation for public parks*, providing for an expenditure of \$30,000 for the removal of loam from Sudbury River basins. This never came before the Water Board at all, and was stricken out of the appropriation after a short debate in the Council. (Page 296, Proceedings of the City Council, 1879.)

On June 13, 1879, the Park Commissioners sent a report to the Water Board (page 459, Proceedings of the City Council, 1879), in which they urged the economy of taking out the loam at the expense of the water works, the amount to be refunded by the Park Department when the City Council should make an appropriation therefor. This request was referred to the city engineer June 23, 1879, in the following form: "Voted, That the engineer be requested to report to this Board his views as to the importance of removing the loam from the basins in Framingham."

On June 26 that official made the following report, which has been made so often the butt for attacks on the Water Board:

Office of the City Engineer,

City Hall, Boston, June 26, 1879.

L. R. Cutter, Esq., Chairman Boston Water Board:

SIR,—In response to the vote of the Water Board, requesting me to report upon the importance of removing the soil from the Sudbury River storage reservoirs, I would say that I have always considered that it would be necessary to remove a certain amount of the surface loam where the depth of flowage will be but a few feet, and a considerable sum for this purpose was included in the preliminary estimate of 1873. In the report accompanying the estimate it was stated in reference to the reservoirs that "they all flow large tracts of meadow land supporting a rich vegetation which it is desirable to have removed by grubbing and excavation, as it will otherwise have to be gotten rid of by gradual decomposition."

Later, after the work of construction began, it was thought that an inexpensive dam near the head of Basin 2, which would keep the water from being drawn below a fixed level, would prevent, partially at least, troublesome vegetation at that point, and the dam has been built.

In Basin No. 1 there is a larger proportion of shallow flowage, and it is most probable that it will be found necessary to strip the soil from a comparatively large area to prevent the growth of aquatic plants. This was not done during construction, first, because the city owns only a narrow strip along the greater portion of the border of the basin, which does not afford sufficient room for the permanent storage of the material (if placed upon the land it would be liable to be washed in time into the reservoir again by rains), and, second, because the water can be drawn down without interfering with the supply to the city, thus making it possible to do the soiling at any time in the future, when experience shall have shown just what is needed.

It is not expected that any work of this kind will be required in Basin 3, as it is quite deep and its banks are rather abrupt.

There are, then, considerable areas of land in Basin No. 2 from which it is very desirable, and other areas in Basin 1 from which it will probably be found necessary, that the soil should be removed.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH P. DAVIS, City Engineer.

It will be noticed that the above report was in response to a request of the Water Board. A majority of the Water Board recommended a

special appropriation of \$50,000 for the purpose of removing soil from Basins 1 and 2. Basin 3 was not included.

I did not see fit to sign this recommendation, believing that it was not for the interests of the Water Department. That I was not alone in this conclusion will be seen by examining a letter of the then president of the Common Council published in your paper of Nov. 12, 1881, and also a report of the present city engineer made to the City Council April 12, 1880, in which he says, "Basin 3 is generally deep and has steep slopes. It must be stated here, however, that owing to the increasing rate of the water consumption of Boston, and in view of the possibility of a dry season, it would not be advisable at present nor until other basins are provided, to empty Basins No. 2 and No. 3."

In answer to another communication from the City Council April 3, 1880, on the subject of the removal of loam, the Water Board sent a report April 12, 1880, from which the following extract is made:

"On June 23, 1879, the Board, by a vote, requested the city engineer to report to them his views as to the importance of removing the loam from the basins. Previous to that time, the Board had not considered that the soil in the basins would seriously affect the purity of the waters, at least not to such an extent as to warrant so large an expenditure as its entire removal would necessitate. They did, however, have some 15,000 cubic yards removed during the construction of the basins, from places where it was known that the flowage would be shallow, but upon receipt of the report of the late city engineer on June 26, 1879, the Board at once communicated to the City Council, recommending that they be authorized to remove the soil under a special appropriation for that purpose."

The above extract shows conclusively the opinion of the whole Board at that date.

Basin 1 has no brooks or sources of supply in itself, but was built principally to reduce the heads on the dams above; in fact, it has never been used to supply the city to any great extent, its usefulness being principally confined to supplying the million and a half gallons the Water Board are required by law to empty into the river daily.

Now as to Basin 2: The water in this basin has never given any trouble, and to it the city chiefly owes its continued supply of water during the last few years of trying droughts; and very curiously, while it has been necessary to shut off Lake Cochituate from the supply, owing

to the bad taste in the water, it has never been found necessary to resort to this alternative in the case of Basin 2. It is, to say the least, peculiar that if the loam is the source of the recent troubles in the water, this basin has been uniformly good.

It is a matter of fact that the basin from which it was never designed to remove the loam has been the one which has given the city continual trouble from the growth of algæ. Again, it can be found, by any one really desirous of arriving at the truth, that the growth of algæ is not confined to new basins, and that the presence of these troublesome microscopic plants can by no means be traced to the presence of loam. The pond in which the first and thickest growth of algæ developed within my experience was Horn Pond; and many besides myself have seen the water in this pond, usually clear and limpid, so filled with these minute organisms that the water was ropy and as green as grass from their presence. Now, Horn Pond is an old natural basin.

The Water Board have employed all the well-known experts of established reputation that they could hear of to investigate the causes of the bad taste which has periodically visited its sources of supply; but, with one or two exceptions, nothing of a very satisfactory or practical nature has been developed. Professor Rensen, in his report of the causes of the bad taste in Farm Pond last year, as is well known, ascribed the trouble to the presence of *Spongilla fluviatilis*, a low form of animal life which occasionally visits even the purest sources of supply. When Farm Pond was drawn down, the judgment of this expert was verified. The sponge was found growing freely wherever there was a rocky surface for it to cling to, but it was in no case found where there was a muddy surface. A very erroneous impression has prevailed, largely due, as I believe, to the indefatigable efforts of certain persons, in the public prints, to ascribe the late bad taste in Farm Pond water to the presence of loam deposited from the basins.

So far from this proving true, when the water was drawn down, the shallow shores of this pond were found to be pure sand, remarkably free from any vegetable deposit, and after the canal was built around Farm Pond, at a cost of about \$15,000, no further bad taste was noticed in the city.

To undertake to show that I have gone contrary to the recommendation of the engineer in regard to the removal of loam will not be supported by the record of the facts. Engineers are far from believing, even at the present time, that loam is the source of trouble to the water supply.



DRAWING-ROOM, 1 ARLINGTON STREET.

The city engineer did not even recommend or include in his estimate for the construction of Basin 4 any estimate for the removal of loam from that basin, and this estimate was made as late as 1881, as will be seen from the proceedings of the City Council for that year, page 541. The following extract will speak for itself:

Mr. Morrison of Ward 23—Does this appropriation include money to thoroughly remove all the soil from this basin?

Mr. Greenough—It does not; the engineers are very much in doubt as to its being worth the amount of money required to take it off. But if the gentleman will offer an amendment to add a sum for the removal of that loam, I will not oppose it. I think it ought to be done. I am not certain what it will cost, but think \$40,000 will cover it.

Subsequently, on motion of Mr. Morrison, that amount was added.

In regard to the charge that I have attempted to influence the action of the City Council by lobbying with its members, I desire here, once for all, to state that I have never tried to influence any member on this or any other subject.

When my opinion has been asked it has been freely given; this is my uniform habit, but I have never volunteered advice except in a formal report over my own signature. During the twelve years that I have been connected with the management of the water works, it has been my constant aim to administer its affairs to the best of my judgment and for the interests of the citizens. If any one outside of the engineering corps and other scientific experts employed by the Water Board, can add to the useful information now in the possession of the Board on the subject of the improvement of the quality of the water, or the enlargement of its supply, I, for one, am ready to hear him gratefully; but it strikes me as being simply a loss of time to undertake to investigate and combat the many petty theories which have been recently advanced so freely by persons who are not experts on the subject with which they attempt to deal, and who, by their wilful and determined prevarication with the fact have forfeited the confidence of all men of common sense.

LEONARD R. CUTTER.

[Chairman Cutter of the Water Board gives the official history of the loam in the basins in a lengthy but very lucid, straightforward and interesting communication printed on the sixth page of this paper. It will be conceded after a reading of this new version of the matter that fully

as much has been made of the loam in the basins as it will bear. The city engineer appears to have originally contemplated removing it only in "small areas," and letting the decomposition of "three seasons" complete the work of producing conditions similar to those of a natural lake. But it so happened that the city had to call on the storage basins at once, and would have suffered a water famine without them. Mr. Cutter's singleness of devotion to the great interests in his keeping has never been questioned.]

In the fall of 1882 Albert Palmer was elected Mayor of Boston. Previous to his election the following appeared in the paper:

"The intimation has been thrown out that the mismanagement of our water department will be used, in the coming municipal campaign, as a reason for the election of Mr. Palmer. It is not easy to see upon what political grounds this issue can be raised. If we are not greatly mistaken, all of the three present members of the Water Board are Democrats in their political convictions. The party which may, in a few weeks more, put forward Mr. Palmer as its candidate, will have to ignore party ties if it proposes to carry on its campaign upon this theory. None the less, it may be said that there is a great deal to be desired in the present management of this department. The bad taste which seems to be inseparably connected with the water which comes to this city from the Cochituate-Sudbury system is probably due to defects of some years' standing. It is pretty evident that the loam should have been removed from the basins on the line of the Sudbury River before the water was let into them, and two, at least, of the present commissioners are personally responsible for this blunder. It is not, however, an easy task for the Mayor of Boston to remove men from office who are not wilfully corrupt. He shares the power of removal with the City Council. That is to say, he can do nothing without a majority of the City Council supports him in the action. If the removals rested wholly with him, as they do in the case of Mayor Low in Brooklyn, the people could hold him responsible for not exercising his personal authority in the present instance. The question is really a serious one. We have spent an immense sum of money, but we are not obtaining for this the results which we should receive. It is probably too late in the year to take action, but we cannot but think that, if six months ago Mayor Green had disposed of the water commission in the same manner that he disposed of the police commission, his action would have received the support of all but an insignificant minority of the people of this city."

After Mayor Palmer's election the following is a statement of the dilemma in which he finds himself:

CITY HALL GOSSIP.

THE MAYOR'S DILEMMA ABOUT THE WATER BOARD.—THE EXTRAORDINARY PRESSURE WHICH HAS BEEN PUT UPON HIM.—

THE WORK OF SOME OF THE RETIRING
HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS.

One of the issues on which the last municipal campaign was conducted by the Democratic party was that there must be a change in the Water Board, and when the new City Government was inaugurated a pressure was brought to bear upon the Mayor to remove the members of the Board for cause. As week after week passed and nothing was done, some of the leaders of the party thought it a wise move for the City Council to declare that in its opinion the Mayor should exercise the power vested in him. Accordingly such a measure was introduced, and it passed both branches without opposition. But still the Mayor hesitated, and showed no disposition to send in the names of three gentlemen to succeed the present incumbents, though he was strongly urged by some of his political advisers to take a decided stand and end the matter. In view of this apparent hesitation on the part of the Mayor, it was not strange that numerous aspirants for the position should desire to know the reasons which actuated him in his delay. These inquiries, which were made with great pertinacity, have revealed a state of facts which are not at all consoling to those who sought a salary of \$3,000 per annum, while at the same time they show that the Mayor has not been in a very happy frame of mind in contemplating the animosity that he must inevitably arouse on the part of those who consider their claims as equal, at least, to the three who may be fortunate enough to have their names presented for confirmation. To say that candidates are numerous would but feebly express the fact. Slate after slate has been arranged, but in no instance has it been entirely satisfactory, and hence repeated changes have been made without, however, arriving at a definite conclusion. If the conferences which have taken place in the Mayor's office relative to the composition of the Water Board could be made public the report would form one of the most interesting chapters ever written in municipal history, and would show that although the Mayor's inclination

to appoint the best men was good, the influence of politics balanced the scale and has succeeded thus far in preventing any nominations. Current rumor says that word was received from the State House that a certain person must be put upon the commission, and to help this nomination along two others were to be selected, against whom not a word could be said. The plan worked well until it was found that one of the gentlemen relied upon absolutely refused to be a candidate, which position of affairs was more than once repeated, as others refused to become a part of the proposed combination. To make matters worse, the Mayor was positively informed that the nomination reported to be prompted by a high Democratic official would not be confirmed in either branch, as it was understood that indirectly some one had an interest in a water meter which it was deemed unwise to encourage.

At this juncture of affairs the scheme was broached of having a Water Board appointed to serve for nominal salaries and not be required to devote their entire time to the service of the city. Although the Mayor has not been an open advocate of the measure, it is pretty well understood that he supports it, as thereby he sees relief from his present difficulties, in that those who are now the most earnest for the positions would no longer be candidates if the change were made, and he would be enabled to secure the services of three excellent men. The new movement assumed official shape at the meeting of the Common Council on Thursday evening when Mr. Greenough, from the Committee on Water, reported amendments to the existing ordinance, which provide that each member of the Water Board shall receive \$1,000 per annum. No sooner had the report been made than it was opposed by some of the Democratic members, who, a few weeks ago, were the most strenuous advocates of a change in the interest of the citizens of Boston, and Mr. Parkman could not resist the opportunity of reminding them that when a plan was presented which would enable the Mayor to exercise his judgment and obtain the best men, those very Democrats opposed that very desirable legislation. The order failed of a passage because the necessary two-thirds vote could not be had to suspend the rule requiring the order to lie over until the next meeting, but as more than a majority of the members of the Council voted to suspend the rule the opponents of the order concede that it is certain to pass, as only a majority vote will be needed at the next meeting. The course of the Mayor in the meantime will be watched with interest, as the anxious ones whose hopes will be destroyed if the salary of \$3,000 per year vanishes are redoubling their

efforts to persuade the Mayor to take action on Monday next and send his nominations to the Board of Aldermen.

The dilemma is, however, solved by a report of Committee on Water with an order requesting the removal of the present members of the Water Board.

THE REMOVAL OF THE WATER COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. Morse of Ward 9 called up the past assignment, viz.:

Report of Committee on Water, with an order requesting the removal of the present members of the Water Board. (Appended to the above are minority reports from Messrs. Greenough and Marshall.)

The question was on accepting the majority report.

Mr. Morse of Ward 9—The order which comes down to this branch of the government was passed January 29 in the Board of Aldermen, and it has been on the table and assigned, and the matter has not been taken up. I think it is time that some action should be taken in this Council in reference to it. The order as it comes from the Aldermen, and signed by a majority of the Committee on Water, is that his Honor the Mayor be requested to remove the Water Board. On that question I desire to say that I do not think it is an order which this Council ought to pass in that form. The ordinance under which we are acting provides for the removal of the Water Board, and the provision is contained in Chapter 27, page 64, of the revised ordinances as printed in City Document No. 17, and reads as follows: "Any member of said Board may at any time be removed by the Mayor with the consent of the City Council; or he may be removed by a vote of two-thirds of the whole of each branch of the City Council on a vote taken by yea and nay." Now as the order comes down from the Board of Aldermen and in the report of the committee, it provides for the removal by another process not known to the ordinances or to our law; it provides for a request; it provides for removal by address. If it is the intention of this City Government to remove the Water Board, it is putting the cart before the horse. There is only one class of officers in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who are removed by address, and that is under a provision of the Constitution of Massachusetts. Article 1, Chapter 3 of the Constitution reads as follows:

"The tenure that all commission officers shall by law have in their offices shall be expressed in their respective commissions. All judicial officers, duly appointed, commissioned and sworn, shall hold their offices

during good behavior, excepting such concerning whom there is different provision made in this constitution; provided, nevertheless, the Governor, with consent of the Council, may remove them upon the address of both Houses of the Legislature.”

That is the only case which is known to me where in this Commonwealth any officers can be removed by address. We have no provision in our laws, either in the charter or in the ordinance passed in pursuance of the act of the Legislature, by which we can remove any officers by address; and the plain intent of the order recommended by the majority of the committee is to remove by address. Now I do not believe that the effect of an address has any binding force. You might as well tell the Mayor to nominate men in their place. You might as well request the Mayor to exercise any of the functions of his office. We are not an advisory board, and it is not for us to give advice because it is not sought for. If the Mayor desires to take the initiative in the removal of the commission there is a statute whereby he may do it. He may remove under the ordinance I have mentioned, with the consent of the Council. His removal will take effect, and it requires only a majority in each branch. In other words, if the Mayor takes the initiative, a majority vote only is needed; if, however, the initiative is taken by the City Council, there is another provision in the ordinance, and that is that it shall be done by a two-thirds vote in each branch, taken by yea and nay. Now the committee simply make the recommendation, not that we shall act upon it ourselves *ab initio*, from the beginning, but that we shall refer the request to the Mayor and ask him to do that which we seem to be afraid to do, or do not wish to do, in accordance with the ordinance as it is now in force. Now, I believe in doing business in a business-like manner. The Mayor has not removed the Water Commissioners, and therefore he does not ask our consent; and I do not believe that if we request him to remove, and he then removes them, that the removal will be valid, unless when he has taken the initiative the question comes back to the City Council for consent. In other words, if the Mayor acts he must proceed with our consent; but if we act of ourselves it requires a two-thirds vote of each branch. Now, I am ready to meet this issue, and meet it in accordance with the spirit of public opinion, which to-day is dissatisfied with the water which we are drinking and with the Water Commissioners. For that purpose I offer an order, which I will send to the Chair, which embodies my idea about the manner in which this matter shall be brought up; it is an order that the Water Commissioners be

removed. I offer it as a substitute for all the reports which have been made by the Committee on Water, majority or minority.

The order offered by Mr. Morse was that Leonard R. Cutter, Albert Stanwood and Timothy T. Sawyer be and they are hereby respectively removed as members of the Boston Water Board.

Mr. Parkman of Ward 9—I do not believe the Council at half-past eleven o'clock want to tackle this question with a substitute order offered and the probability that a division will be called for upon each of the three commissioners. I therefore move that it be specially assigned for 8.45 P. M. at the next meeting of the Council.

Mr. Houghton—I hope this will not be assigned. It was assigned for two weeks and laid over for another week; that makes three. I think we are fully able to tackle the question to-night and have some action upon it. For that reason I hope the motion to assign will not prevail.

The question was taken and the motion to assign was declared lost. Mr. Parkman doubted the vote. A division was had and the motion was lost—26 for, 32 against.

The question was on the adoption of the substitute offered by Mr. Morse.

Mr. Wharton of Ward 11—I should like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Water whether or not the commissioners have had a hearing before that committee; whether specific charges have been made against the commissioners and whether the commissioners have been heard upon those charges.

Mr. Houghton—I would answer that they had no hearing before the committee this year, and no specific charges of any kind have been preferred to the committee. The reason we took that action was on account of that part of the Mayor's address relating to water. We took that into consideration, and for that reason we offered that order for the removal of the Water Board.

Mr. Wharton—Under those circumstances I move to refer this to the Committee on Water, with instructions to hear the Water Board before they make any recommendations with regard to their removal. I make that motion for this reason; that I do not think that this City Council should undertake in any case to remove officers of the city unless they have had a fair hearing. I think when any motion is made to remove officers, that motion should be referred to a committee and that the committee should have specific charges presented to them, and that the persons charged should have an opportunity to be heard before the com-

mittee. I think that is fair, just and proper; and for my part I will say I should be unwilling, nay, I should never vote to remove any officer under such circumstances as these unless he had had a fair opportunity to present his case to the appropriate committee. And I hope that in fairness and justness to the gentlemen who at present constitute the Water Board that this order may go to the Committee on Water with the instructions I have suggested.

Mr. Whitmore—I think any one who has been here for over a year and who remembers the case of the Police Commissioners and the utter farce of the hearing that was given to them will feel very little sympathy with the complaint now made by the gentleman from Ward 11. He belongs to the party and belongs to the party of voters on that occasion who certainly ought not to ask any favors for any personal or political friends in matters of this kind. But that is immaterial. The point to which I wish to call attention is in regard to the motion made by the gentleman from Ward 9, and I should like respectfully to ask him, through the President, what warrant there is for any such motion as he makes. I am one who has voted steadily against the Water Board, I believe, for the last three years, every time we have chosen a new member, and have protested against and antagonized all the new members as they came along; and for that reason I believe that the Council is ready to come to this matter with no reservation, except that we should act in the proper manner. As I understand, the gentleman from Ward 9 has said there are two modes of removing these officers; one is by the action of the Mayor, consented to by the City Council, and the other is by a two-thirds vote of both branches, and he puts in a motion here directing the removal of these officers. Now it is very true that he finds that authority in the ordinance, but I would like to find where there is any authority for putting it into the ordinance. The act is Chapter — of the acts of 1875, and that says: "The City Council of the City of Boston may establish by ordinance a Water Board to be known as the Boston Water Board, consisting of three able and discreet persons to be appointed by the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the City Council." I fail to find anything in the act which shows specifically how they may be removed. It says that their salaries shall not be diminished, but I do not find any provision in the act for the removal of the Water Board; and if there be no specific power, I believe it to be a well settled principle of parliamentary law that the removing power must be the same as the appointing power. In other words, if they are appointed by the Mayor and assented to by the City



LEONARD R. CUTTER, AGE SIXTY-SEVEN.

Council, they should be removed by the Mayor, and the removal should be assented to by the City Council, and all that portion of the so-called ordinance which allows the Board to be removed in any other way I believe to be without warrant of law. It is for that reason that I raise the question. Because, if I am right it is a motion which the Chair must rule out of order—the motion offered by the gentleman from Ward 9.

Mr. Wharton—I do not think the gentleman is speaking to the question. The question is upon my motion to refer with instructions.

Mr. Whitmore—I will explain why this should not go to the committee if the gentleman will give me time enough.

Mr. Wharton—Then I rise to another point of order; that it is too late for the gentleman to argue that this substitute is not before the Council, because it has been put by the Chair and a motion in regard to it has been made. I understand the whole argument of the gentleman at present to be directed against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ward 9.

The President—The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Ward 11 to refer to the Committee on Water, with instructions to give the parties a hearing. If that motion prevails it cuts off the substitute.

Mr. Whitmore—With the permission of the Chair and of the Council I will proceed to explain why this matter ought not to go to the committee, as the gentleman from Ward 11 asks. If the motion itself which is now pending is an improper one, this Council, I take it, is not going to waste any time in sending it to the committee. If the whole matter is to come before us in one certain way, and that is by the act of the Mayor removing them and sending the matter to us for our consent, there is nothing to refer, there is nothing to be heard; the whole motion made by the gentleman from Ward 11 would be utterly ridiculous, because there would be no longer any charges against the Board. The whole object of the gentleman's motion to refer depends upon the vitality and the legality of the motion which the gentleman from Ward 9 has made. Now if the gentleman wishes at this time to push his motion for reference to the committee, I hope the Council will vote it down in order that the gentleman from Ward 9 may have a chance to defend or explain his motion. If I am right in my position that we have nothing to do with it, that the ordinance undertook to provide for another method of removal than that which was named in the act, that any such motion is illegal, there would be nothing to refer to the committee at all. We must

wait until such time as the Mayor sees fit to make the removal and asks for our consent. If the gentleman from Ward 11 insists upon his motion, I hope the Council will vote it down and then see whether there is anything before us or not. I, for one, am very desirous of hearing from the gentleman from Ward 9.

Mr. Wharton—I may be laboring under some hallucination, but I understand the state of things to be this: The Committee on Water submitted a majority report; accompanying it are two minority reports. The gentleman from Ward 9 offers a substitute. That is in the nature of an amendment, and I moved that the whole matter, the three reports and the substitute, be referred to the Committee on Water. My intention was not by any means to cut off the substitute of the gentleman from Ward 9. I never contemplated such a thing for a moment. I submit that my motion before the Council carries with it the whole matter, the reports and the substitute, to the Committee on Water.

Mr. Marshall—I hope the motion of the gentleman from Ward 11 will prevail, and that the whole matter will go to the Committee on Water, because that is the substance of the minority report which I submitted, accompanying the majority report. In this case no specific charges are alleged; no members of the present City Council know whether the members of the Boston Water Board are responsible for the bad water; nobody knows that they are incompetent men; and I doubt if any of us can vote intelligently upon this question with the information we now have. In regard to specific charges, a gentleman who signs the majority report, in a report made year before last on the commissions, makes use of the following language:

“The commissioner appointed for a term of years is not held up to the performance of duty by anything except his personal sense of honor and his dislike of criticism. He may be removed for cause, it is true; but the power of removal would probably not be exercised except in a very flagrant case of official misconduct.”

Now, gentlemen, there is no charge of official misconduct in this case. There has been no case of official misconduct, and until such things are investigated and a report made thereon, we have no right in justice to vote to remove those men. I certainly hope the motion to refer to the Committee on Water will prevail, and that the members of the Water Board will have a hearing, which even a criminal is allowed to have, and let us decide upon the report, whether the charges are true or not.

Mr. Bronwich—I hope that will not be referred. The citizens of

Boston for five years have by their action and voice protested against the acts of the Water Board. Yet the gentleman who has just taken his seat tells us there has never been any charge made, or anything done to criminate these gentlemen, our Water Commissioners. Now, if the public are of no account, perhaps, there has not been any complaint, for I have often wondered what the Water Board or the Water Committee have been doing for the past five years, to find that there is nothing wrong. Certainly every gentleman must know that our water that is supplied to us under the government, and by the orders, and under the jurisdiction—if I may use that word—of gentlemen whom we have paid upwards of nine thousand dollars a year to supply us with pure water—I say if the people haven't made complaint enough for them to take notice of it, I think it is time some one took notice of it now. I consider myself that a great many of our commissioners are more ornamental than anything else, and are placed there to be looked at rather than to be valued as understanding their business. It is very well for the city of Boston to have such an ornament to show off to some of the potentates that arrive in this city, and to show what sort of gentlemen we keep; but it would be a great deal better for the taxpayers of Boston to-day if they placed men there who understood their business.

The President—The gentleman must confine himself to the question of reference to the Committee on Water.

Mr. Bromwich—I hope it will not be referred for this reason: That we can take hold of it now and decide it at once. If it is referred to this committee again it will perhaps lie within the committee the same as it has laid with the committee for the last five years, and perhaps just as long. Therefore, I hope it will be taken in hand and settled, and that the gentlemen will be removed, if possible, by this Council.

Mr. Morse of Ward 9—If I may be allowed to answer the question put to me by the gentleman from Ward 12, without speaking too closely on the question to refer, I would like to answer him in a few words, and simply say that under the acts and resolves of 1875, quoted by the gentleman from Ward 12, it is provided that the City Council of the city of Boston may establish by ordinance a Water Board, to be known as the Boston Water Board. There is a provision that a Water Board may be established by ordinance, but it is not to be presumed for a moment that we should simply pass an order like this. It is to be presumed that the ordinance lies in our right to establish this Water Board by ordinance, of establishing it in such manner as the City Council in its judgment

thinks best. There is derived the authority for forming the ordinance which has been framed. Now on the question of the reference to this committee I must confess that it is entirely immaterial to me whether the matter is referred or not. I offered the order not with any personal or political hostility towards the Board of Water Commissioners, but in order that this Council and the City Government may proceed in a proper and legitimate manner to the performance of its duty, and in the way provided by law. I can find no authority by which we have a right to address the Mayor, and I do not want the Council to set the example of addressing the Mayor for the removal of a commissioner. If we set the example now we do not know where it may turn up in some subsequent year. We will have the same state of affairs they had in New Hampshire; one year a Republican Governor and Legislature, and all the Democratic officials removed by address without cause; and next year a Democratic Governor and Legislature, and all the Republican officials removed by address without cause. Now I do not believe that is the way to do business. If the City Council wants to have the onus of removing these commissioners they will do it upon the order I have offered; if the Mayor wants to do it let him do it without being addressed by the action of this Council. And I want to say here again that I do not urge this on account of any personal animosity against the commissioners; although I must confess—and I think it is well known—that in my judgment the commissioners have lost public confidence, and I think the public would be well satisfied if the matter was settled and settled forthwith by the removal of the commissioners.

The motion to refer to the Committee on Water, with instructions to give the commissioners a hearing, was declared carried. Mr. Houghton doubted the vote and the Council was divided, 25 for, 33 against.

Mr. Wharton called for the yeas and nays upon the question of reference, because he wanted to put upon record those gentlemen who are willing to remove officers of the City Government without any hearing whatever.

The President—The question is not debatable upon the call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the motion was lost, yeas 26, nays 33:

Yeas—Albree, Bacon, Bond, Boynton, Burk, Chickering, Cummings, Emery, Farwell, Fisk, Freeman, French, Goodman, Greenough, Hathorne, Hichborn, Hilton, Marshall, G. Morse, L. W. Morse, Parkman, Peterson, Thomas, Thomes, Wharton, White—26.

Nays—Barr, Barry, Boyle, Bromwich, Cassidy, Denney, Doherty, Donnelly, Finnerty, Fitzpatrick, Foss, Fraser, Gallagher, Houghton, Killion, Lappen, Lee, Lombard, F. P. Maguire, P. J. Maguire, Marley, McLaughlin, McNamara, F. J. Murphy, J. A. Murphy, O'Brien, O'Flynn, Orr, Quigley, Strange, Sullivan, Trull, Whitmore—33.

Absent or not voting—Blume, Dean, Donovan, Eddy, Howland, Morrison, Richards, Smith, Strater, Wakefield, Weld, Wise—12.

Mr. Whitmore—I believe the pending motion now is the substitute of the gentleman from Ward 9, and I wish to make a reply. Although it is perfectly true that we have a right to establish this Board by ordinance, that does not meet the point in the section which the gentleman did not read, although I did, which says we may by ordinance establish a Water Board consisting of three able and discreet persons. That does not go so far as to say they may be removed. The next step is that the act says how the men are to be appointed. It is usual in these acts to make a provision how the men may be removed, but in this case they do not seem to have done so. Now I do not wish to see this Council commit themselves to any mistaken course. I do not wish them to pass a vote which has no power whatever. I have sufficient confidence in the general principle that where no power is mentioned of removal, it lies with the same persons and in the same order as the appointing power. I have looked up the question this afternoon in every text-book I was able to refer to and have not the slightest doubt upon that point, but, sir, as it is very late, and as the votes do not disclose a majority of the Council in favor of the measure, and as I think this matter is too important to be passed over lightly, I move to refer this question to the Committee on the Judiciary to get the opinion of the Corporation Counsel as to the power of removal. I move to refer the whole subject to the Judiciary Committee.

The motion to refer to the Judiciary Committee was declared lost. Mr. Whitmore doubted the vote. The Council was divided, 32 for, 22 against. Mr. Doherty of Ward 2 doubted the vote, and on his motion the yeas and nays were ordered. The motion to refer to the Judiciary Committee prevailed—yeas 36, nays 25:

Yeas—Albree, Bacon, Bond, Boynton, Bromwich, Burk, Chickering, Cummings, Emery, Farwell, Finnerty, Fisk, Freeman, French, Goodman, Greenough, Hathorne, Hichborn, Hilton, Killion, Lombard, Marshall, Morrison, G. Morse, L. W. Morse, F. J. Murphy, Parkman, Peterson, Smith, Sullivan, Thomas, Thomes, Trull, Wharton, White, Whitmore—36.

Nays—Barr, Barry, Boyle, Cassidy, Denny, Doherty, Donnelly, Fitzpatrick, Foss, Fraser, Gallagher, Houghton, Lappen, Lee, F. P. Maguire, P. J. Maguire, Marley, McLaughlin, McNamara, J. A. Murphy, O'Brien, O'Flynn, Orr, Quigley, Strange—25.

Absent or not voting—Blume, Dean, Donovan, Eddy, Howland, Richards, Strater, Wakefield, Weld, Wise—10.

Mr. Wharton moved to reconsider. Lost.

Adjourned, on motion of Mr. Cummings of Ward 10.

In May, 1883, the Water Board was removed and my father finished his public life.

Through all these years of activity I never knew him to seem worried or troubled. He would get very weary, but sleep always renewed his strength. He had a feeling of regret that his labors were so little appreciated, and he said he might again and again have taken dishonest spoils, which he always refused, and not have been treated any worse; but in that case he would have lost his self-respect which he retained most decidedly, and years proved that it was no disgrace to be turned out by such a government nor to be supplanted by such a Board, who in their turn were soon displaced.

On January 10, 1885, about two years after he left the Water Board his views were solicited and were given in the following from the press:

THE WATER RATES.

DISSATISFACTION AT THE RECENT INCREASE.—IT IS UNCALLED
FOR AND UNNECESSARY.—VIEWS OF EX-CHAIRMAN
OF THE WATER BOARD CUTTER.

To say that there is dissatisfaction on the part of a large number of the citizens of Boston over the recent increase in water rates only mildly expresses the present situation, and, with a large number, the explanations that have been made as to the necessity of the increase have not been satisfactory. Knowing the long experience that ex-Alderman Leonard R. Cutter has had in the matter of determining water rates, from his long service on the Water Board, a *Traveller* representative waited upon him yesterday, for the purpose of ascertaining his views in the matter of the recent increase. Mr. Cutter was found at his office on Leverett Street, and was disinclined at first to say anything about the matter, for

the reason that should he give his views his motives in expressing them might be misinterpreted, "but," said he, "since the publication of Mayor O'Brien's inaugural I have been tempted to send a communication to some one of the newspapers concerning one item in Appendix E, or the communication of the Water Commissioners to the mayor-elect. In the communication Chairman Simmons, speaking for the Board and defending the inspection system, says:

"The following tabulated figures show, in a condensed form, the beneficial results of the inspection system. The consumption has been reduced from 98 gallons per head in January, 1883, to 61 gallons per head in November, 1884.'

"Now you will notice that he compares the month of January with its thirty-one days, and the necessity which prevails during such month for a large extra use of water to prevent pipes from freezing, with the month of November with its thirty days, and open mild weather when there is neither a necessity for an extra use of water for lawns or yards nor for the prevention of freezing in the pipes. Such a comparison is manifestly, as will be seen from a moment's consideration, unfair, and if the system of inspection which has been adopted has no better grounds of justification than this there was little necessity for its adoption. As to the increase in rates, I will say this, that with a wise and judicious management on the part of the Water Board, I do not think they were necessary. In some cases the increase in rates is phenomenal. For example, I find that the rates at house owned by myself on Garden Street have been raised from \$18 to \$65. I have not as yet examined the rules by which this increase has been made, but it is a pretty large increase at all events."

Traveller representative—What, in your opinion, has been the reason for making an increase in the rates?

Mr. Cutter—I suppose it has been for the purpose of increasing the revenue. The law requires the Board to make rates high enough to pay the interest on the water debt and meet the running expenses of the department, and I take it that the increased expenses of the department demanded an increased revenue.

T. R.—How is it that the expenses of the department have so largely increased as to demand these higher rates?

Mr. Cutter—These have increased through the adoption of the inspection system, the larger introduction of meters, which has necessitated the creation of new offices under the Board, and an increased number

of employees. I do not know definitely, but I take it that the pay-roll of the department is nearly double at the present time what it was two years ago. Of course this, as well as the extension of the meter system, greatly increases the expenses of the department.

T. R.—But is not the increased use of meters in the end really economical?

Mr. Cutter—This question of the general use of meters is one which has not been so thoroughly understood as it should be. The cost of the meters proposed by the Board is about \$1,000,000. The meters will only last about five years, when they are worn out and must be replaced by new. The cost of keeping them in repair, of superintending them during the five years, is probably a quarter of a million more. At the end of that time they are worn out, and the million and a quarter of dollars is gone with nothing to show for it. Had this money been used in constructing storage reservoirs for the immense amount of water that annually runs to waste in the Sudbury River, by these reservoirs we should amply provide for a full supply of water, and at the end of five years should have in them something of permanent value to show for the money expended, instead of a lot of worn-out and worthless meters which at the expense of an additional million dollars must be replaced with new. It should also be remembered that it costs little or nothing to keep them in repair. At the same time the costly system of inspection would be avoided, and the takers of water would not have ground for complaint in increased rates, with no better if indeed as good a supply. I can but regard, for these reasons, with others, the recent increase in rates as wholly unnecessary and unjustifiable. It will perhaps be remembered that in 1882, with an increased indebtedness, and so with a larger interest expense, the expenses of the department were fully met and the water taxes were reduced in that and the three preceding years \$130,000. Perhaps, however, the taxpayers will look with favor on the present management, with its largely increased demand for revenue.

Mr. Cutter was disinclined to talk at length on the matter, or to go into extended detail, but had no hesitation in expressing the opinion that the increase of water rates, about which so much complaint is justly made, was entirely unnecessary, and is the result of the adoption of an uncalled-for and injudicious system.

The following is a letter from Mr. Sawyer, a member of the Water Board with father and who was removed at the same time. Also one

from Hon. A. E. Pillsbury, whose acquaintance with my father extended over a number of years.

Boston, Dec. 9, 1895.

DEAR MADAM: I have received your note, and am glad to know that you are preparing a memorial of your father, the late Mr. Leonard R. Cutter.

I was associated with him as a member of the Boston Water Board in 1876-7-8 and again in 1882—four years. Reciprocal respect and kind feeling characterized, I trust, our relations with each other. I believed in his ability, honesty, and determination to serve the city faithfully, and I felt that he had confidence in me as a public official. Difference in judgment as to the best course to pursue sometimes occurred, but serious discussion usually led to unanimity of action. Mr. Cutter was an outspoken man, and in the management of many difficult settlements of individual claims against the city it could hardly be expected, with his temperament, that he would never give offence, but it is due to his memory to say that a just conclusion for the claimant as well as the city was always his aim and intention.

I look back upon my association with him with pleasure. He was conscientious and efficient in the performance of his duties, and I think I am justified in feeling that much was accomplished, of unmistakable value to the city, by the efforts of the Water Board while he was a member of it.

Very respectfully yours,

TIMOTHY T. SAWYER.

Boston, Nov. 19, 1895.

DEAR MRS. BIGELOW: My acquaintance with your father began at the time when he was a member of the Boston Board of Aldermen. His influence there was great, and may be said to have been controlling, at least in respect of many subjects with which the Board had to deal; and his election to the Presidency of the Board would be sufficient evidence by itself of the leading position which he took there. Later as a member, and I believe as Chairman, of the Water Board, during the period of the taking of the Sudbury River and the various operations which arose out of that movement, he may be said, without exaggeration, to have been in control of the water department of the city. In both these positions his characteristic qualities were brought out to a marked degree. He was a man of great natural shrewdness and business capacity, but his

most prominent traits, as it always appeared to me, were his force of character and force of personal will. He was as fond of his own way as any man I ever saw, and I think he succeeded in having it as often as any man. He was a zealous guardian of the interests of the city, and if he made any mistake in his public capacity, it was, I think, in being sometimes so firm and uncompromising as to excite hostility where a little diplomacy might have been valuable. But diplomacy was a very small part, if it was any part, of his character. He was a striking and characteristic example of the successful men who have come down to this metropolis from our native State of New Hampshire, with no capital but their wits and their hands, and by these alone have acquired fortune and reputation.

Very truly yours,

A. E. PILLSBURY.

I cannot close this chapter better than by adding a letter from Mr. Desmond FitzGerald, who has been many years connected with the Boston water supply and who was greatly esteemed and respected by my father. He writes:

"My first acquaintance with your father dates from early in 1873 when he was Chairman of the Western Division of the Cochituate Water Board. At that time I was just entering upon my duties as Superintendent and was unfamiliar with the methods of transacting business at the City Hall. Almost the whole of my time was spent upon the work, where I found much to occupy me. Unknown to me a conspiracy was formed against me in the Board, and one of the charges was that I had been guilty of extravagance in the purchase of a pump. My election was laid upon the table and a committee was appointed to go out and investigate me. Your father was appointed upon the committee, because he seemed so strongly in favor of investigation, and the others thought they could count upon him. They came out and spent several days driving about and examining everything. I was delighted to see them, supposing it was simply a visit arising from friendly interest in the work, and explained everything so fully that the committee, when through with their labors, made me a little speech, your father being the spokesman. He rehearsed the errand upon which they had come and stated that he had been won to my side by what he had seen, and said that they were going back to 'put me upon my feet,' and it is needless to say that they did it. I did not quite take it all in at the time, but from subsequent experience

I can see that it took some pluck to stand up against the politicians in the strong way that your father then did. It is needless to say that we were friends ever after that occasion.

"For many years I was intimately associated with Mr. Cutter in the conduct of the water works. As you know he afterwards became Chairman of the Board and exercised much influence and I believe always on the side of an honest administration of the city's interests. He was very outspoken, and necessarily made some enemies, but every one knew where to find him when it came to a question of sides. His strong common sense and accurate knowledge of men and business affairs saved the city large sums of money.

"I remember very well that when the referees in the Sudbury Mill damages made their awards, that all of those cases were finally settled for very much less money and largely due to the course that your father pursued. Nothing seemed to worry him or to ruffle his temper. I have no doubt that he owed a large part of his success to his vigorous constitution.

"I have seen him on several occasions show up some enemy who under the guise of friendship, was plotting against him, and we have often compared notes in these matters; for public life is a constant battlefield, where even those who appear to be friends may be striving to pull each other down to gain some temporary advantage.

"During the long term of service which your father devoted to the offices of the Water Board he gave almost all of his time to the duties of the office, and I don't think he ever settled a land case without a personal visit to the premises and a careful examination of all of the details entering into the case. While intrusted with the expenditure of large sums of money, the city never lost a penny from his oversight, and his personal account was always an economical one and systematically kept. As I look back upon the many years of close association with your father in city matters, I can find no cause for regret, and I should like to live them all over again.

"Very truly yours,

"DESMOND FITZGERALD."

CHAPTER VIII.

HOME LIFE.

Just before my father left the Water Board he purchased the house on the corner of Arlington and Beacon Streets, which he fitted up for his home and where he lived until he died in 1894. The following notice of the purchase was found among the numerous clippings preserved by him:

"A FINE RESIDENCE.

"Chairman Leonard R. Cutter of the Board of Water Commissioners purchased on Thursday the elegant house on the corner of Beacon and Arlington Streets, with a frontage of 52 feet on the latter thoroughfare and 85 feet on Beacon Street. The lot comprises 4,420 square feet, the house being of brick with a handsome front on Arlington Street, five stories in height and fully adapted for a first-class family residence. The price paid was \$56,500 and it is considered by all who were present at the sale as one of the best bargains in real estate that have been made in this city for years. The sale was made by Samuel Hatch, the terms being one-third cash, the remainder—at the option of the purchaser—on a mortgage at four and one-half per cent."

We all had great pleasure in fitting up that home, and we were busy for a long time with paper-hangings, carpets and furniture. We regretted leaving the old home on Hancock Street where we had lived eighteen years and been so happy together, and we all knew that, according to the natural course of human events, we should never spend as many years as that together again in this life; but it was a much larger house and in a much finer location, and the years we did spend there were most enjoyable.

After leaving public service father devoted himself again to the care of his real estate. He continued to buy more and more as years went on. In 1884 he built several houses on Washington Street and increased his number of tenants. He seemed to enjoy his business, and seldom took any extended vacation. He enjoyed travelling, but never took time for long trips. The few trips which he did take were greatly enjoyed by him. In February, 1857, he went west on business, and visited his sister in

Illinois; again, in 1863, he went west with mother, and they took the trip around the Great Lakes, and encountered a most severe thunder-storm. Poor mother was terribly seasick; and father always enjoyed laughing at her about it and repeating the remark she made at that time, "What a foolish woman I was to leave my nice home and come 'way out here!" She was so sick she said she didn't care whether she lived or died. The children were left with her sister in Framingham.

In 1865, just at the close of the War of the Rebellion, father went south with a friend. I will quote from some of his letters which he sent home. From Philadelphia, under the date of May 16, 1865, he writes:

"I am here at the Continental House, and opposite is the Gerard House. We had a good trip to New York City on a tip-top boat; arrived there this morning about half-past five. We ran round over that city until four this afternoon, then we left, and arrived here at eight this evening. It is now nearly twelve, my usual bedtime. I presume that we shall be in Baltimore to-morrow. The steamer, I understand, leaves there at five P. M. every day for Richmond, Va. I do not know, as yet, whether we shall go to-morrow to Richmond or stay over a day. We have had thus far a good time; good weather: a little warm today for comfort. I like this city very much, much better than New York. O— and I have just come in from promenading the street.

"We attended the Gold Board in Wall Street, New York, also the Corn Exchange. O— found plenty of acquaintances there, who introduced us around.

"New York is a dirty place and a very large city. We took an omnibus and rode the length of Broadway, which was fine this morning; came back through Fifth Avenue, which exceeds our Beacon Street. Gov. Gardner has recently purchased a house there for which he paid two hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars. I don't think it looks nearly as well as Beacon Street does in Boston.

"I think this city is splendid; wide streets and nice houses."

The next letter on the trip is dated Norfolk, Va., May 18, 1865. He writes:

"I am here and well. We came by boat from Baltimore; left there about 5 P. M., arrived at Fortress Monroe about 7 A. M. and here about nine this morning. It is very warm here, but comfortable this evening.

We go up the James in the morning at six. I have seen nothing inviting since we left Philadelphia. It is hot, dusty and dirty here and at Baltimore. We had a pleasant sail on the steamboat last night; we had to sit up and watch the men, for we could not obtain a stateroom. We played euchre most all night to pass away time, besides watching the men. I saw the sun rise out of the water this morning. The Chesapeake Bay is a fine sheet of water. I saw many of the rebel prisoners and talked with them. We had a fine ride from Philadelphia to Baltimore yesterday. Strawberries and cherries are plenty here."

The next letter bears the following heading:

"Richmond, Va., May 21, 1865.
Brevt. Major General L. A. Grant Head-Quarters.
Half-past nine P. M.

"You see by the heading of this letter where we are. I wrote you last in Norfolk. We left the next day for this place, Richmond; had a delightful sail up the river that day. We found Major Brooks very soon after we arrived and stayed with him that night in a house close by his tent. We heard through him that General Grant was within a mile of him. We met him in Richmond with his staff and he knew us at once; since then he has taken us in charge. He at once after meeting us gave his horse to his orderly and got into our carriage and bade his staff good-by. He was expecting to find O—, and had provided a room for us, in which we stayed last night. We are going to stay with him to-night in his tent. We have spent the day riding around Richmond and other places of interest, as Fort Darling, which is some eight miles from here. We are going to Petersburg to-morrow morning; start at five o'clock. He furnishes us with plenty to eat and drink and horses to go where we please, horseback or in wagons. I am very well.

"We have had some powerful thunder-showers here; one is coming up now; the lightning is very sharp and thunder heavy. The general is very well; he got wet to his skin to-day coming from Fort Darling. We were in a carriage. He was on his horse; also his staff, who got wet also. We were very fortunate to know him, as being in high rank we can get just what we desire. He is going from here to Washington; will be six days on the road; he wants us to go with him. O— wants to go, but I cannot, for I want to be at home on the first day of the month. He is going by the way of Fredericksburg and Bull Run, which would be

places of interest to us. We intend to leave here for Washington day after to-morrow, should nothing prevent. Brooks and Grant both send their regards to you. I would not have missed coming out here for five hundred dollars. We are having a tip-top time. I called on the rebel general, Lee, to-day and had a short talk with him. The city of Richmond is a fine city, but the business part is laid in ruins. The part where the nice residences are is very fine. The people here all look down; the women go veiled; and there are Union soldiers enough here to conquer all creation. I am keeping O— and the general waiting, so I must close. It is lightening, thundering and raining just now very hard.”

He was most favorably impressed by General Lee and always delighted to relate his interview. It was Sunday morning when he called; the general was just starting for church with his wife. He was very polite, however; asked his wife to wait a few moments, and so of course father kept him only a few moments. In speaking about the treatment of our prisoners the general said they were starving and suffering themselves and could not give the prisoners better fare. The general's manner and bearing greatly impressed father.

The last letter on this short southern trip is written from Washington and bears the date May 26, 1865: “We have arrived here as you see. Came this forenoon from Baltimore; arrived there this morning after five o'clock, from Richmond, which we left yesterday morning at six o'clock. We came by steamboat. Since I wrote we have been to Petersburg, where the fighting was done, and saw many things there of great interest. We had General Grant there to show us round, which made it of superior interest by his explanations, as he led the front column in the great battle that compelled the Rebs. to evacuate Richmond. We did not get into this place to witness the grand review that came off here on Tuesday and Wednesday, but we saw a review in Richmond of the 6th Company which is said to have done more fighting than any other in the army. I am going to the post office to see if you have not sent me a letter, for I begin to want to hear from Boston. We met a gentleman and lady from Union Park, Mr. and Mrs. H——. Mrs. H—— said that she had seen Aggie at her daughter's birthday gathering; she is in the same Sabbath-school class with her. We found them in the Capitol building in Richmond; they went to Petersburg with us, and they left their hotel and came to ours. They have gone to Harper's Ferry to-day. We now intend to be in Boston Monday morning, at what hour I cannot tell. I shall spend Sunday in New York and go through on the night train.

I have been very well ever since I left. How are Aggie and Emma? I suppose they are going to school. I begin to want to be heading towards home. I have seen about enough for this trip. But I would not have failed to see what I have for five hundred dollars. We have had excellent weather until to-day it is raining, not very hard though. We did camp duty two nights; the first one was about as bad as that night on Lake Michigan. It thundered and lightened and rained all night, and nearly blew our tent down. The water ran through some of the soldiers' tents and washed away their shoes. This place has been run over the last few days with whiskey."

Gen. L. A. Grant alluded to in these letters was from Vermont. He and my father's travelling companion married sisters and these sisters were cousins of my mother's.

While father was in Washington the trial of Mrs. Surratt and others for the murder of Lincoln was taking place. My father pronounced the whole thing a farce, and felt great sympathy for Mrs. Surratt. The trial was held in a heated upper room before those unfitted to try any one, much less a woman who seemed to be so much of a lady. It was so near the end of the war that things were not adjusted, and the right persons not in their right places, so mistakes many and dire were made.

In 1878 he took his wife and elder daughter on a delightful trip through the White Mountains, stopping at all the large hotels.

In 1880 he with his two daughters went to Saratoga, from there to Laek George, thence up Lake Champlain to Plattsburg, then across the Lake and Vermont through the White Mountains, and by way of Maine and Old Orchard back to Boston and Jaffrey, where we were spending the summer. We always had the loveliest times with him, for he believed in going to the finest hotels when one travelled and seeing all there was to see. Just before starting on this trip he shaved off his beard, which he had always worn, and had only a mustache. We called him our German boy, and it really made a great change in him. He never wore his beard again.

Occasionally he would take short trips to Saratoga or New York with his gentleman friends, but he never travelled extensively, the better part of his life being very closely spent in Boston, the interests of which were very dear to him.

The Boston home was always closed the first of July and we went to Jaffrey for three months, and father would always spend the Sabbaths with



MERCY T. CUTTER, AGE SIXTY.

us and the latter years of his life would come up Fridays. He loved the Jaffrey home and was delighted in working about on the place, trimming up the trees, fixing the stone walls and keeping the place in good order. In 1884 his elder daughter went abroad for six months. He was rather unwilling to let her go from fear of accidents, and said he never gave his consent even after he had purchased her tickets and accompanied her to New York, but upon her safe return he seemed very much pleased that she had been. He was a most indulgent father and gave his children all that was in his power and consistent with his good judgment to bestow.

In March of 1885 came the first break in the family when his younger daughter, Emma, was married to H. W. Baxter, Jr., of Brighton. She went to Brighton to live, and he very handsomely furnished her house for her. Living as near as she did, she was at home a great deal, so that the family circle did not seem to be broken.

My father, after his public life ended, was a very domestic man. He always, except during the years of his public life, took his three meals at home with his family, and spent his evenings with them. He had no taste for club life and never belonged to any organizations. He was very fond of games and would spend evening after evening playing backgammon, checkers or cards with his family and friends. One of the pleasantest memory pictures of the Jaffrey home is a beautiful summer afternoon with the setting sun throwing its long beams under the grand old trees in front of the house, two armchairs brought out where it was cool on the lawn in front of the door, and in these chairs two silver-haired people, my dear father and mother, with the backgammon board in their laps, playing away with as much zest and earnestness as if they were in their teens. Father used to say if mother were losing, that he had to watch pretty closely or she would throw the dice so fast that she would get in a throw ahead of him. How often I have seen them entertain each other in that way!

On Sabbath days father always stayed at home. He lost his habit of church attendance at the time of the war, when to his great disturbance, he said, they made a recruiting-desk of the pulpit, but he thoroughly believed in Sabbath-keeping for old as well as young, and was strict with us children in that respect. On week-days he would go to his office about nine o'clock, collect his rents, look after his repairs, visit the bank and get home to dinner at two o'clock. He generally took a short nap after dinner, and then would go out again to return to supper about half-past six. He was a most prompt and systematic man; he never could have

attended to all the business he did had he not been so. His wife was a most able assistant in this promptness. I never knew one to spend any time waiting for the other, or putting to order things left around by the other. Our meals, with very few exceptions, were always promptly served. We were always expected to be prompt at the breakfast table, no matter how late we had retired. Father would say, "I want you at the breakfast table; you can go back to bed afterwards." I feel a great debt of gratitude for the habits of promptness thus early instilled into me.

Just here I insert the latest personal recollections that Mr. Moses Runnels has written me in regard to my father:

"Finally, after another lapse of thirteen years, I was providentially called to the pastorate of the East Jaffrey Congregational Church, in the autumn of 1886. Its new parsonage was the first house east of the Melville estate, which was still owned by our friend and occupied every summer by himself and his excellent family.

"There being no barn or stable to the parsonage, Mr. Cutter allowed me, as his old friend and schoolmate, to keep my horse and carriages in his barn which was commodious and conveniently near, with the unlimited use of his hay-mow and ample carriage-house for the space of nearly four years, and all without money and without price.

"Himself and family were also liberal contributors to my support as pastor during those years, and were frequent and most respectful attendants upon my ministry. Socially, the summer sojourns of Mr. Cutter's family at this home are counted among the most pleasant of our more recent Jaffrey memories, both to myself and the members of my household.

"While I was also permitted to enjoy several delightful interviews and reunions with my old schoolmate, during his short visits from the city, I found him possessing the same genial, kind-hearted, exuberant and overflowing nature that I used to notice and admire in his youthful days. The soul of honor; intelligent and well read in all the questions of the times; alive to the interests of his old friends and the old parish where his boyhood was passed; a sincere lover, to all appearances, of that which is good and, at the same time, a keen detector and unsparing denouncer of all shams and hypocrisies. One of the most pleasant of these social occasions was the fiftieth anniversary of his sister, Mrs. Edmund P. Shattuck's wedding, at his old paternal homestead, near Jaffrey Centre, May 18, 1887. His remarks at that festal reunion were most happily conceived; humorous, pathetic, terse, businesslike, yet chaste and beautiful,

with all the artless simplicity of a little child once more under his father's roof; most eloquently bespeaking, also, his loving heart and tender respect for the dear departed.

"Newport, N. H., Jan. 10, 1895."

"MOSES T. RUNNELS.

In November, 1887, the oldest and only remaining daughter was married to Dr. Enos H. Bigelow of Framingham and went there to live. Her father furnished her home for her. Both daughters were now gone, but their homes were not very far away; still I think both my father and mother felt the loneliness, although my sister was at home every day and I went home two days in every week. At the wedding some gentleman remarked to father that he ought to have had more daughters; he answered. "What use? Some one like you would have come along and taken them off and they would have left me." I remember his telling mother just about this time that they were now just as they were when they commenced their married life thirty-five years ago, just two of them. Father was very bright and hopeful about it, but the change in the home affected mother and she began to lose strength in many ways, although she was very brave and said very little about it. While she was very happy to have her children married, she missed them in the home. I recall her saying most sorrowfully when my sister was married, "Now Emma has a different name from ours." My mother's life was wholly given to her husband and children, and as long as her children lived at home with her, so long she expected the same deportment as when they were in their teens. We never thought of buying anything without consulting her, nor of going out without telling her where we went and how long we were to be gone, and she couldn't understand how a family could be conducted in any other way. It seemed to her the only natural way.

My father's success with real estate was such that he continued to invest in it more and more, and by so doing his number of tenants increased until the care of them was enough to more than occupy his whole time, and he was obliged to have assistance; but he always had the renting of the different places and knew each tenant personally. All the good tenants liked him very much; those who tried to evade paying their rents and who were not square in their dealings would complain of their landlord.

The following is a letter from a widow who hired a large house of him for a number of years and whose gratitude is beautifully expressed. She removed from his house in debt to him and started in another locality.

MR. CUTTER:

"Boston, Jan. 5, 1881.

Dear Sir: I send you one hundred dollars (\$100) towards rent, and had not Mr. T——, of whom I hired the money in October, 1880, pressed his need for \$100 of the amount, you would have received another \$100 in December of 1880.

"Painfully regretting my inability to meet demands as promptly as they are due this winter, I can only say that seven years of struggle and sacrifice without cessation have not yet exhausted or abated our indomitable energies and honest efforts to overcome adverse circumstances irremovable as they sometimes seem.

"The boarding public are not willing or are not able to pay a full equivalent for what they require, as a rule; consequently it is a hard and often bitter struggle to make two ends meet and keep up a bare semblance of respectability in household and personal appointments.

"The ordeal of wading through the terribly unequal and labyrinthine business passages, heaped up as they are with so many difficulties, and still retain the consciousness of divine presence and divine aid, is fearful and almost faith shaking; yet I cling to the cross and cry, 'Abba, Father, help! help!' and I think He always strengthens me.

"One blessing we have always had in this business and that, our creditors when there was a necessity were ever patient and encouraging—a blessing indeed! And may we have the unrestrained privilege to tell you how with inexpressible gratitude we are conscious of your extreme patience and forbearance toward us, and how that your repeated consideration and clemency and trust would often bring light and warmth into our darkened and dulled lives, and often when I would fail to be enabled to bring forward promptly your just dues I could only cry, 'Father in heaven! good Master and just, be merciful, oh, be very merciful and bountiful in favors to him and all he holds dear, who has never oppressed the widow and the fatherless and who has been so patient with us. And oh, for every day of waiting and for every year of losing enrich him and his a hundred thousand fold, for he hath been kind to the stricken ones!'

"Daughter and I have felt our circumstances and condition keenly and painfully since having been left alone in the world, and for every kind consideration we are very, very grateful. And we feel that on the advent of the New Year it is your due to know that for your trust in our honest efforts and considerate kindness in our emergencies we have in our soul pilgrimage to the great white throne, where we lay our daily burdens down, many a time carried a vital living remembrance of our

good landlord and his dear family for God's especial blessing. And oh, while I ask that the New Year may bring to you and yours a prosperity intact from a shadow even of adversity, and a peace transcendently calm and happy, I plead also to be enabled from the auspices of this new birth in time to cancel fully every obligation pecuniary because justly due.

"Tangible proof alone stands out clearly defined, indisputable, unquestionable and firm, however pure the motive or honest the effort to succeed. And now, begging your clemency for the seeming intrusion on your time and patience, I ask God's blessing again and again on you and yours, and address myself

"Very respectfully and sincerely,"

"_____."

The above letter was pleasing to him, and he showed it to us at the time he received it. I found it among his letters that he had preserved.

His patience and good-will towards his tenants and employees were remarkable. After disease had commenced to undermine his strength during the last years of his life, he said he could not keep his patience; that he was like an old dog, cross and snarly; and he asked my sister's husband to come and help him in the care of his property.

After Mr. Baxter came to his assistance he formed the habit of spending a few hours each day in the stock office of a friend of his, and dealt a little, but never very extensively, in stocks. He never was very fortunate in making great sums and was not in sympathy with the business. I have heard him say what one lost another made. At this time he felt that he didn't care to burden himself with any more real estate, so used his surplus in this way. He enjoyed very much the society of the gentlemen he met there. His first investment was in Union Pacific, and it was a familiar expression at the dinner table, where he would come directly from the stock office, "Father, what does U. P. spell to-day? Up or down?"

He was always in the habit of talking at home about everything that he was interested in, so the encounters with the tenants, the conversations of those wishing tenements, etc., were well known to us, and rarely was there anything to cause trouble or anxiety. We were all, as a family, anxious to have mortgages and notes all paid when they were due, and felt the same ambition that father did himself. Our requests for money were never refused, only it would be given to us with some such remark as this: "Don't fool your money away," "Get a good equivalent for the money you spend," "A penny saved is two earned."

When I went to Europe in 1884 father entrusted me with a good-sized letter of credit, and with it a few wise precepts. Among them I distinctly remember, "Don't tell all you know; find out, if you can, what others know, but keep something in reserve." Some extracts from a few letters written while I was in Vassar College will show how kindly his advice was always given.

In closing one letter in which he sent a check, he writes: "I suppose the return I have for my money is in your improving your time." I find a letter dated Oct. 22, 1872, which was a reply to some foolish request of mine, I suppose, but I have wholly forgotten what it was, and yet this letter shows how hard it was to refuse me what in his judgment was unnecessary and trivial and how he tried to have me see it as he did. The letter reads:

"DEAR A—:

"I should have written you before now but for the pressure of responsibility I have on me at the present time. I really desire that you would not put us to the trouble of sending more things than is necessary while you are at Vassar.

"While, as you know that I am and always have been ready to gratify any reasonable desire of yours, still I can't see the propriety of sending presents by express.

"You are coming home at Christmas, and then a present will be just as acceptable and it will save a good deal of trouble and risk of sending it by express.

"And then it is not judicious to put money into jewelry, for you soon get sick of it. You had better have it earning interest.

"Your mother and I will leave probably the most of our hard-earned fortune for you and Emma. You don't now how hard and what a sacrifice I made when a small boy to start my fortune.

"I saved every cent, and I suppose it has doubled many times since. You can judge supposing you were by necessity obliged to earn your support. You can see how important it would be to lay by every cent. Your age now ought to give you a judgment on the business of this world, so that things of more intrinsic value and of more importance should occupy your mind than trinkets of no real value. You will find as you grow older that one thing you will have to learn, and that is self-denial. For if you allow yourself to indulge in anticipation you will find it harder to overcome than reality itself. Now you know that I do not

want to say to you (at your age) that you sha'n't or shall, but I desire you to look at the thing in its true light, and by so doing you must agree with me, and then you will not place your heart on a trinket."

On October 19, 1870:

"I suppose you have been looking for a letter from me. But as your mother writes so often and receives letters from you it has seemed as if there was nothing that I could write in addition to what has been written. I presume it to be a tax on you, in addition to your many studies, to write so many letters, but a person inclined to think of home will delight to write home often. I well remember when I left home that I corresponded with my mother quite often, and I well remember how glad I was to receive a letter from home, and my mother was quite a capital hand to write. I have her letters yet; some time it may please you to peruse them."

After quite a newsy letter he closes:

"As I am more used to writing short business letters, I think this letter may not be of interest to you without it be the stamps and the money.

"You must not fool your money away, but spend it where and when it will do you the most good."

My father was very fond of pets, birds and animals of all kinds appealing to him. Living in the city with the exception of a few months in the summer, our ownership of pets had to be restricted to the very domestic cat, and later we did not have even that. I recollect, when we were children and did have a cat, how interested father was in her and how much he petted her. He never owned a horse. We always rode a great deal in the summer, but we had a bill at the livery stable. Father said there was so much care about horses, a shoe would be thrown, or the horse would be lame, or something would need attention all the time, and the horses would be more care than recreation. He enjoyed playing with the neighbors' dogs in Jaffrey, but he never owned one.

My father was quite a talker. It was one of the family traits. He was fond of relating his experiences. I often wished that he had taken more time for travelling, for the little that he did was made so interesting by his relation of it.

As we drove around Jaffrey, the home of his boyhood, almost every

place would be the occasion for some pleasant remembrance related in his very earnest way. He would talk by the hour of his experiences while connected with the Boston Water Board, of the men he met through the different transactions, the settlements he made, etc. One could learn a great deal from him in a short space of time. He was a very good judge of humankind. He was rather conservative by nature, not easily prejudiced, but where a strong prejudice did possess him, it was next to impossible to change it.

He liked books, but never took time for very extensive reading. He was always thoroughly conversant with all political interests of the day, and beside that read more of history than of any other subject. He enjoyed reading the Bible, particularly the New Testament, of which he bought a copy in very large print that he might read it without his glasses.

I have found among his papers quantities of cuttings from newspapers, poems as well as prose that interested him. I have made a very few selections from them which will show to a certain extent what appealed to him.

Fight on, though ye bleed in the trial,
Resist with all strength that ye may;
Ye may conquer sin's host by denial;
For "where there's a will there's a way."

Life is neither a pain nor a pleasure, but it is a reality; and it is our duty to accept it and carry it through with honor.

That life is long that assumes life's whole end. He most lives who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best. He lives long who liveth well; all other life is short and fades. He liveth longest who can tell of living most for heavenly gain.

He liveth long who liveth well.
All else is being flung away.
He liveth longest who can tell
Of true things truly done each day.

He prayeth well who loveth well
Both man and bird and beast ;
He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small,
For the dear God who loveth us
Hath made and loveth all.

Coleridge.

THE SEED AND THE SOWERS.

Ever so little the seed may be,
Ever so little the hand,
But when it is sown it must grow, you see,
And develop its nature, weed, flower or tree ;
The sunshine, the air, and the dew are free
At its command.

If the seed be good, we rejoice in hope
Of the harvest it will yield.
We wait and watch for its springing up,
Admire its growth, and count on the crop
That will come from the little seeds we drop
In the great wide field.

But if we heedlessly scatter wide
Seeds we may happen to find,
We care not for culture or what may betide,
We sow here and there on the highway side ;
Whether they've lived or whether they've died,
We never mind.

Yet every sower must one day reap
Fruit from the seed he has sown.
How carefully then it becomes us to keep
A watchful eye on the seed, and seek
To sow what is good, that we may not weep
To receive our own.

THERE IS ROOM AT THE TOP.

They say the professions are crowded
By seekers for fame and for bread,
That the members are pushing each other
As close as their footsteps can tread.
But be not discouraged, my brother,
Nor suffer exertion to stop;
Though thousands on thousands are pressing,
There is plenty of room—at the top.

Be true to thy love and thy country—
The coward wins never a prize;
But the earnest are ever the victors,
And he who on justice relies,
Who wins the good guerdon by labor,
Will garner sweet rest as his crop;
And find, as the hills sink below him,
That there is room enough at the top.

O, let not the evil disturb you,
There's good if you but search it out;
Make pure thy own conscience, my brother,
Nor mind what the rest are about.
And whether your work may have fallen
In sanctum, or office, or shop,
Remember the low grounds are crowded,
But there's always room—at the top.

THE ELM OF THE OLD MORSS HOUSE.

All night around the ancient house
The screaming winds I heard,
All night the ghosts of witches old
Were from their slumber stirred;
Amidst the black and ruined walls
The giant elm tree lay,
That cast its patriarchal arms
Above me yesterday.

And as I listened came a groan
From out the prostrate bole,
As if there breathed in one last gasp
A suffering Dryad soul:
"What voice is here?" the sighing air
Brought back the sound of woe;
"Alas! I was a goodly elm,
But now I lie full low.

"I grew a sapling, tall and strong,
In sunshine and in storm,
My boughs made music in the blast,
And shade in summer warm;
My roots were fixed in native earth,
My locks I waved on high,
And here where first I had my birth
I hoped in peace to die.

"Ah! many a legend, strange and old,
Have I to tell of yore,
The wonders of 'oulde Newberry,'
The folk that are no more;
The Quakers mild, the witches dire,
Of Cotton Mather's day;
A goodly hangman sure was he,
A goodly priest to pray.

"Ah! many a night, in sad affright,
Against the walls I leaned,
I saw the wrinkled hags at work,
I saw the great foul fiend;
And maidens fair, with demon heart,
Who revelled in their sins,
Pinched pious people black and blue,
And stuck with crooked pins.

"Alas! alas! those days are gone,
And gone this ancient place,
Old Newbury doth now contain
A mercenary race;

They've pulled the house upon my head,
And for an inch of ground
They've cut away the goodliest elm
In all the region round.

"They've chopped me up for firing wood,
They've torn me limb from limb,
And here they'll put a paltry box,
All painted white and prim;—
The villains! if they burn me e'er
In stone or iron grate,
I'll fire the house and tumble in
On every rascal pate.

"May heaven confound these new-made cits!
Their bones are out of joint,
They'll spoil the place from Oldtown green
As far as Salisbury Point:
Mine ancient neighbors opposite
Have heard the butchers talk
Of cutting down *their* reverend heads
To make a new brick walk.

"No more shall I woo passers-by
And children fresh from school,
No more in August's blazing noon
Shall spread my shadow cool;
My bough has bowed to ruthless axe,
My glory downward sunk,
They've packed my twigs and piled them up,
And now they pack my trunk.

"Ah! well-a-day! with one last word
I leave the thankless town;
One parting curse to blast the Goth
Who cut the old elm down.
O listen, sympathizing friend,
Before I yield to death;
I'll pour my very spirit out
In one expiring breath:

“Ye powers! that rule o’er trees and men,
Grant him a hapless lot,
To wander like the weary Jew,
In some Sahara hot;
To travel all his weary years,
And ask in vain for shade;
And when he dies his bleaching bones
Amid the sands be laid.

“Or, if he live and here remain,
Then grant, O righteous heaven!
That never tree save gallows tree,
May to the wretch be given.
A murderer’s heart is in the man
Who kills an aged tree;
I do advise the mayor wise
To watch him warily.

“A murderer’s heart is in the man
Who kills an aged tree;
He’ll kill his aged father next,
Or baby on the knee.
Farewell—I die,”—the elm tree paused,
No sound came forth again;
I only heard the wild wind scream,
I heard the pelting rain.

Newburyport.

B. A. W.

Earth has many a cool retreat,
Many a spot to mem’ry dear;
Oft we find our weary feet
Lingering by some fountain clear;
Yet the purest waters flow
In the land to which we go.

FRIENDSHIP.

Thrice blest and happy is the heart
Where Friendship lingers still;
And all the feelings gently yield
Submissive to its will.

Through life, where'er our footsteps roam,
Let Friendship grace the heart;
And may we learn to love aright
The joys it will impart.

How sweet the words, "We will be friends,"
And we will roam together,
To meet the sunshine and the shade
Of life's uncertain weather.

A. W. Ten Broeck.

A HOME FORSAKEN.

It stands by the roadside, gray and still,
No window open, no door ajar;
Nor laughter, nor weeping, nor echo will
The depth of that silent brooding mar.

The lilac raises her lovely face,
Laying it softly against the pane.
Is she seeking a friend in that quiet place,
A form which will never return again?

Closer she leans as the seasons go,
To the walls which had sheltered her well;
Longing to screen them that none may know
The tale of desertion they tell.

Deep 'mid the weeds and the tiger blooms,
Sunken, forgetting its old-time place,
The door-stone lies, and the spider-grass plumes
Are bending lower to hide its face.

On the gray low bases, vines, clinging yet,
 Droop sadly over the fast-closed door,
Reaching for hands they cannot forget,
 Which will part their green tendrils no more.

Down by the fence pale cinnamon rose
 Is straying idly through long rank grass,
Patiently seeking a face she knows;
 She listens and longs for a step to pass.

She has blushed and faded many a day,
 With the red damask rose by her side;
For lily and rose and lilac stay
 Where no other than they may abide.

The poplar trees by the fallen gate,
 Growing ever more gaunt and more gray,
Shudder and tremble and watch and wait,
 Perhaps for the dead—who can say?

For never more may that still home keep
 In its heart human hopes, joy or pain;
Alone it stands, while its children sleep—
 It will never enfold them again.

Ah, cinnamon rose and damask sweet,
 Lily and lilac and clinging vine,
Fashion a fragrant winding-sheet
 For this sorrowful friend of thine.

Spread softly over the hushed old place,
 Where thy growth and thy beauty first bloomed;
'Tis fitting that in thy soft embrace
 The forsaken lie gently entombed.

From Good Housekeeping.

IF YOU SHOULD EVER GET MARRIED.

If you should ever get married, John,
I'll tell you what to do—
Go get a little tenement,
Just big enough for two!
And one spare room for company,
And one spare bed within it—
And if you begin love's life aright,
You'd better thus begin it.

In furniture be moderate, John,
And let the stuffed chair wait;
One looking-glass will do for both
Yourself and loving mate;
And Brussels, too, and other things,
Which make a fine appearance,
If you can better afford it, they
Will look better a year hence.

Some think they must have pictures, John,
Superb and costly, too;
Your wife will be a picture, John,
Let that suffice for you.
Remember how the wise man said,
A tent and love within it
Is better than a splendid house,
With bickerings every minute.

And one word as to cooking, John—
Your wife can do that best;
For love, to make the biscuit rise,
Is better far than yeast.
No matter if each day you don't
Bring turkey to your table—
'Twill better relish by and by,
When you are better able.

For all you buy, pay money, John—
Money that very day!
If you would have your life run smooth,
There is no better way.
A note to pay is an ugly thing—
If thing you choose to call it;
When it hangs o'er a man who has
No money in his wallet.

And now, when you are married, John,
Don't try to ape the rich;
It took them many a toilsome year
To gain their envied niche.
And if you should gain the summit, John,
Look well to your beginning;
And then will all you win repay
The toil and care of winning.

ON LEAVING HOME.

'Tis hard to part from those we love,
To breathe the fond good-by,
'Tis then our hearts within us move,
And tear-drops dim the eye.
Yet when we know that duties call,
Although it makes us moan,
We leave our friends, our home, our all,
And try the world alone.

But, often, when our minds are sad,
As through the world we rove,
It always makes our hearts feel glad
To think of those we love.
Oh! could I ever have them near
'Twould be my heart's delight;
How many a lonely hour they'd cheer,
And make my moments bright.

But there is One, a friend to all;
He's ready to receive
All those who hearken to his call
And on his name believe.
To Him I'll go in sorrow's hour,
When earthly friends have fled,
And, like the sunshine on the flower,
He'll raise my drooping head.

G. U.

GRANDPA'S BARN.

Oh, a jolly old place is grandpa's barn,
Where the doors stand open throughout the day,
And the cooing doves fly in and out,
And the air is sweet with the fragrant hay.

Where the grain lies over the slippery floor,
And the hens are busily looking around,
And the sunbeams flicker now here, now there,
And the breeze blows through with a merry sound.

The swallows twitter and chirp all day,
With fluttering wings, in the old brown eaves,
And the robins sing in the trees which lean
To brush the roof with their rustling leaves.

O for the glad vacation time,
When grandpa's barn will echo the shout
Of merry children who romp and play
In the newborn freedom of school let out!

Such scaring of doves from their cosey nests,
Such hunting for eggs in the lofts so high,
Till the frightened hens, with a cackle shrill,
From their hidden treasures are fain to fly.

Oh, the dear old barn, so cool, so wide!
Its doors will open again ere long
To the summer sunshine, the new-mown hay,
And the merry ring of the vacation song.

For grandpa's barn is the jolliest place
For frolic and fun on a summer's day;
And e'en old Time, as the years slip by,
Its memory never can steal away.

Mary D. Brine.

We meet around this festive board,
On this "Thanksgiving Day,"
With thoughts of those we love most dear,
At home—too far away.
To parents, sisters, brothers, all,
Our words of cheer we'll send;
Our wishes for their health and joy
With theirs for us we'll blend.

We'll not forget the dear old home
Of boyhood's happy days;
We see it now, with moistened eyes,
On this glad day of Praise.
We will be true to those who said,
"God bless," and "ne'er forsake,"
When to our homes we said "Good-by,"
New homes and friends to make.

Though friendships new may weave their chain
In links of golden love,
Our hearts will ever turn toward home,
With prayer to God above,
That He will guard that good "old roof,"
Protect its inmates dear,
Surround them with His tenderest care,
Their side be ever near.

God grant us strength, as years roll on,
Life's battle brave to fight;
And may our eyes be firmly set
Toward virtue, truth and right.
Then when this busy life is o'er,
And we are called above,
In one eternal home we'll dwell,
With those we dearly love.

A SONG OF GREENBACKS.

Sing a song of greenbacks,
A pocket full of straw;
Four and twenty millions—
Flung away in war;
When the war was opened—
The notes began to fly;
Wasn't that a dainty sight
For such poor chaps as I?
Chase was in the treasury—
Counting out the money;
Lincoln, in the White House,
Was eating bread and honey;
McClellan on the battle-field
Was following our foes—
There came along a blackbird,
And nipped off his nose.

New York World.

A bright little boy of Lewiston has best expressed the utter hopelessness of the Democratic future. He was asked by a lady if he studied hard at school, and replied that he did not hurt himself much at it. "Oh," said the lady, "you must study hard or you will never be President of the United States." "Yes, ma'am," he replied, "but I don't expect to be; I am a Democrat."

WHAT IT COSTS TO SMOKE.

What it costs to smoke is shown by the following computation, upon the basis of a weekly expenditure of \$1, the amount, \$26, being brought in as capital at the end of every six months, at 7 per cent. per annum, compound interest. It amounts at the end of

5 years to \$304.96	35 years to \$7,511.08
10 " 735.15	40 " 10,900.07
15 " 1,341.97	45 " 15,680.59
20 " 2,193.91	50 " 22,423.98
25 " 3,405.37	55 " 31,936.19
30 " 5,108.56	60 " 44,354.11

I write on Candlemas Day, the 2d of February, known in the Middle States as Ground-Hog Day, the ground-hog being our Yankee wood-chuck. The tradition is that at high twelve the ground-hog wakes up, emerges from his hole and looks all around him. If the sun shines brightly enough to cast a shadow, the ground-hog no sooner sees his own, than he returns to his hiding-place, as there is a long spell of bad weather coming. This prediction was thus put into rhyme many years since:

"If Candlemas Day be fair and bright,
 Winter will have another fight;
 But if Candlemas Day be clouds and rain,
 Winter is gone, and will not come again."

Before the heating properties of coal were discovered, when farmers hauled cord-wood for their customers and for their own wood-piles, the New England rule was:

"Just half your wood and half your hay
 Should be remaining on Candlemas Day."

Ben: Perley Poore.

THE STRENGTH OF A KIND WORD.—Some people are very apt to use harsh, angry words, perhaps because they think they will be obeyed more promptly. They talk loudly, swear and storm, though after all they are often laughed at; their orders are forgot, and their ill-temper only is remembered. How strong is a kind word! It will do what the harsh

word, or even blow, cannot do; it will subdue the stubborn will, relax the frown, and work wonders. Even the dog, the cat, or the horse, though they do not know what you say, can tell when you speak a kind word to them. A man was one day driving a cart along the street. The horse was drawing a heavy load, and did not turn as the man wished him. The man was ill-tempered, and beat the horse; the horse reared and plunged, but he either could not or would not go the right way. Another man, who was with the cart, went up to the horse and patted him on the neck, and called him kindly by his name. The horse turned his head, and fixed his large eyes on the man, as though he would say, "I will do anything for you, because you are kind to me;" and bending his broad chest against the load, turned the cart down the narrow lane, and trotted on briskly as though the load were a plaything! Oh! how strong is a kind word!—*Animal World*.

When father first came to Boston a youthful and intense desire to help all oppressed and downtrodden possessed him. When a clerk in a grocery store on the Hill he saw a man and his wife engaged in a most desperate struggle. He immediately started to aid the wife, when to his surprise both united to turn on him. This experience he never repeated. But in this same spirit in August, 1889, he sent the following letter to the paper:

To the Editor of the Record:

Pardon me, but as your paper seems to be fighting for justice to all citizens, I will call your attention to a case of milk inspection that occurred in Foster Street, Brighton, a week or two past, which came under my observation. Timothy Brooks is an old citizen on that street, has kept cows and sold milk for 25 years or more, and a poor man, over 60 years of age, and much respected.

The inspector of milk jumped on to his cart one morning and took a pint can of milk and had it analyzed by *his* chemist and then had Mr. Brooks taken into court and got him fined \$50. The neighbors spoke a good word for Mr. Brooks, and the judge remarked that he knew Mr. Brooks and no one would doubt his honesty, but still he fined him \$50, which his neighbors believe to be a great wrong. The law was made to punish dishonest men, and was not intended to wrong honest citizens.

1 Arlington Street, Aug. 17.

L. R. CUTTER.

The *Record* confesses that it does not see how it can help Mr. Brooks. No doubt he is as highly respected for honesty as our correspondent states, but if the inspector finds in his cart milk that is chemically proved to be below the State's required standard, the only thing for the judge to do was to affix the fine. Mr. Cutter must admit that if danger lurks anywhere for children in summer time it is in bad milk. The babies must be protected. Does Mr. Cutter insinuate that the chemist made an unfair analysis? If not, the decision is all right, and the more so because Brooks is respectable.

Through my sister's husband, who lived on Foster Street, the Mr. Brooks was well known for an honest man, hence the interference without any apparent results. However, in September of 1889 he received the following letter from a brother of Mr. Brooks who was a New England minister:

"MR. L. R. CUTTER, Boston, Mass.:

"*My dear Sir,*—As I returned from the shore towards the end of August and stopped for a night with my brother, Mr. Timothy Brooks, he placed in my hand a copy of the *Boston Record* containing your chivalrous letter on his behalf published after the fine inflicted upon him in court.

"Will you allow me to express to you my very appreciative and hearty thanks for your act so generously and gallantly done. So magnanimously vindicating the wronged is a noble service."

I cannot better draw this chapter to a close than by a few brief extracts from two letters that he wrote his sisters after mother died, relating to her. He writes:

"DEAR SISTER: Pardon me for delaying to reply to your kind letter. I have not been feeling well for some time, no appetite and losing flesh. I cannot get rid of my disease. I get better rest and sleep now. God has taken away my companion and so I am left alone. She was a quiet, unassuming woman, not changed in the least by my success in business. The same in No. 1 Arlington Street as in Grove Place, where I commenced life with her. No silly pride did she indulge in, and was always opposed to my taking offices. When I reached the highest seat in City Hall she and her sister were going by the City Hall, and her sister wanted to call on me, but she would not come in and let her sister come

in alone. No vanity in her; and when Brother Daniel was writing up the Jaffrey history she told him she should dislike to see anything put in extolling me, so you see she disliked fame or notoriety in any form."

In a letter from an older sister written to him after mother's death was the following:

"One week ago yesterday I received a letter from A— saying her dear mother had gone home. I wept. I am weak and selfish. I thought how much I should miss her. How much I enjoyed her company! I always felt at home with her; she had no disagreeable aristocratic airs, was affable and we all clung to her. How many times I have heard my girls say, 'I want to go and see Aunt Mercy.' You feel a void, you see the empty chair, but you feel no doubt that it is all right and for the best. You have my sympathy. You have daughters who will love and kindly care for you. They will miss their mother—oh, so much. She was a home woman; they knew where to find her. She was faithful to her trust. I loved her very much. Let us profit by her unselfishness and feel that our loss is her gain. I believe she was ready to go."

In reply to this letter father wrote under the date of February 26, 1894:

"MY VERY DEAR SISTER: Pardon me for negligence in answering your kind and sympathetic letter. I have not been very well since I lost my companion, but have been out every pleasant day. I am on the gain now, but my appetite is poor. I have hired Mrs. S— to keep my house. E— comes in most every day, and A— is down every week, so I am not lonesome as I might be, but I miss Mercy very much; yet I cannot wish her back.

"So far in my life God has always sustained and guided me in all my business undertakings, and I feel that He will take care of me and return me to good health; that is my prayer."

In May he went to Framingham to visit his daughter, hoping benefit from the change. But it did not come as he expected. He coughed so hard he could not lie down to take the needed rest. He rode a great deal and tried to get up an appetite, but it would not come and he was discouraged. He said to me: "For six years I have got the best of this horrible disease, but it has got me now." In talking with my oldest son,



RECEPTION-ROOM, 1 ARLINGTON STREET.

Leonard, he said, "When do you go to school?" The answer was, "Next fall." Then he said, "Grandpa won't be here to see you then."

After quite a little stay, in which he grew no better, he said he must go home and get things ready, arrange his business, etc. He visited a specialist on his return to Boston, but nothing seemed to be able to check his disease. If he had gained as he hoped, he was planning to go to Jaffrey. He was in Framingham when the apple trees were all in blossom, and it was pathetic to see the sad way in which he would look at all nature, as if to his mind it was a farewell look. It was terribly hard for him to give up life. He said it had never entered his mind but what he would live to be over eighty as his father did before him. But as his weakness increased and one thing after another had to be laid aside, the limbs lost their strength and tottered under him, and finally refused to carry him, and he lay down on the bed, which for two weeks helped him to bear what had literally become the burden of life. Then he became very willing and anxious to go. He was in bed on his birthday, the first day of July, when he was sixty-nine years old. I was with him most of that day, and I said to him, "Well, father, you have almost reached the threescore years and ten; you know the Good Book says, 'The days of our years are threescore years and ten, and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow.'" In reply he said, "I shall be spared that, sha'n't I?" Weakness increased so that he was anxious to go, and with these last words, "This is the end of life," he went peacefully to sleep.

He died as he had lived—everything in order and most systematically arranged, and as far as he could foresee advised us in regard to future contingencies. The Jaffrey home, which was very dear to him, was arranged for in a satisfactory way, and one by one he let go the things of this life and entered into the rest and work of that life beyond the grave.

•

CHAPTER IX.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES.

Our home was always open to any of the relatives and friends who visited Boston. I have asked a few of the nieces and nephews to write for me some of their memories of that home. My cousin, Mrs. Mary (Fox) Jackman of Rockton, Ill., a daughter of father's second sister, writes the following:

"My earliest recollection of Uncle Leonard dates back to 1863. As business necessitated a western trip, he decided to include Illinois, taking Aunt Mercy with him. He wished to surprise his sisters and succeeded admirably. Unfortunately a former visit had been in March, when the rich Illinois soil, converted into mud, made the roads almost impassable, while the second visit revealed the work of the blazing sun, making the roads very dusty. The contrast caused uncle to remark, 'Rockton has turned from a mudhole into an ash heap.' He acknowledged resources of the country in the statement that 'The weeds in Sister Susan's garden grew higher than the house, and the tail of Sister Abby's cat waved high above the table.'

"We played many games of backgammon, uncle often referring to 'Sinbad the Sailor,' etc. On my birthday uncle invited me to accompany him down the village street. Calling at one of the stores he purchased and presented me with a birthday gift. All too soon the visit came to an end. Next time we met was in August, 1867, in Boston. The family were in Framingham for the summer, when uncle called upon me at the South End. He found a very homesick girl and cheered her wonderfully when he said 'Homesickness is not to sneezed at,' and extended an invitation to go to Framingham the following week, and sent for Aggie to come in to accompany us. Such a glorious visit! It effectually cured the homesickness, just as uncle had intended. I spent many happy hours at 25½ Hancock Street during my sojourn in Boston. Uncle always spent his evenings with us, and many were the romps Agnes, Emma and I had with him, up and down the stairs, he going with rapid steps while we were not far behind. It was a great triumph if we caught him. Backgammon was next in order, and his unique sayings amused us greatly.

We all went to Jaffrey the summer of '68, and on one of our pleasure excursions visited 'The Ark,' then uninhabited and 'haunted.' We played blindman's buff in one of the rooms. Our ambition was to catch uncle, a most difficult feat, for he was as agile as the youngest, notwithstanding his two hundred and fifty pounds avoirdupois. It was not until 1873 that I visited Boston again. I found the same cordial greeting, the same jovial uncle, though at this time Mayor of the city of Boston.

"Fourteen years elapsed ere I saw uncle again. He had grown a little older, his dark hair had turned to gray, his step a little slower, his life had not lost its zest and our games of backgammon were as interesting as ever. Uncle did not believe in luck. He said to me, 'I owe my success in life to my good judgment, industry and integrity,' and those qualifications he admired in others. In 1894 we met again. Illness had changed the physical man, but the heart and mind remained unchanged. I saw him frequently. He seemed to cling to his old friends and extended a cordial, affectionate welcome to the last. Shortly before he left us, in referring to a remark made by another, he said, 'I think we never quite reach the spot where we can say, I am ready to go.' Yet he met death unflinchingly."

Mr. Henry A. Cutter, a son of my father's second brother, Edward, a lawyer in Nashua, sent me this pleasant reminiscence:

"Several of Mr. Cutter's nephews became, for the nonce at least, partial substitutes for a son, and their recollections of their associations with him, which extended through a long series of years, present a view of the man which undoubtedly gives to the world a truer index to his character than would be obtained by a long term of business intercourse. It is during the hours of recreation and relaxation that one gets nearer the heart and soul of a man.

"For many years the nephews were accustomed to spend their Sunday evenings at their Uncle Leonard's on Hancock Street. The topics discussed were those presented by the Sunday papers, all of which Mr. Cutter took, or they were of business, reminiscences, or family matters. This was during his connection with the city government, in which he was very much interested. The names of Jenks, Woolley, Stebbins, Viles, Little and others of the aldermanic board became as familiar to the young men as they were to the uncle himself. In those conversations the uncle necessarily took the principal part. He took particular delight in informing them of the doings at the City Hall, all of which could not fail to be

of advantage to the listeners. Those were the days of the Peace Jubilee and the great fire, in the midst of which Mr. Cutter bore no inconspicuous part. His nature was such that, having an interest in a subject, his very being became so impregnated that all around him would naturally acquire an equal interest. It must not be understood that he monopolized the conversation, for he would invariably inquire of his youthful friends how matters went with them. 'What pranks are the boys up to at Harvard, Ed.?' or 'How much sand are you putting in your sugar nowadays, John?' were no infrequent inquiries; and then would follow valuable suggestions as to personal conduct or business management, which would be timely and sagacious. And this advice, coming as it did from one who had made a success of life, given with the utmost sincerity and disinterestedness, worked in an immensurable degree for the welfare of those young men.

"The calls at the old home were not confined to Sunday evenings, as during the week an evening or two would not fail to find one or more of 'the boys' sitting down to a game of checkers or backgammon with their uncle. In the former game Mr. Cutter was more than proficient, and was always a winner, whilst in the latter game his good luck in the throws, combined with rare good judgment in his moves, would win him success in a large majority of the games.

"He would not take his victories in an offensive way, and he would encounter defeat with no chagrin. In a jolly way he would rally his opponents upon their moves. His enjoyment was fully as manifest as it was with his adversaries.

"During the summer at his home in Jaffrey the uncle and the nephews were wont to meet for many seasons. Here Mr. Cutter was a boy among boys. No one enjoyed the thousands of games of croquet there played better than he did. There the merriment was unrestrained, but when some of them would try to move their ball slyly to a more advantageous position, then he would feel indignant. He was as strictly honest in his sports as he was in his business life.

"One of the most pleasing events in their common life were the swims in old Thorndike pond. He, with a half-dozen of the nephews, many times would drive to the place where Mr. Cutter and his brother Edward had bathed forty years before. His enjoyment of the time could not have been deeper or more genuine when he was a boy.

"The home of the uncle and aunt was thus, during the formative period of a young man's life, the place where the nephews unconsciously

absorbed a most wholesome stimulus from a man whose self-reliance, energetic, enterprising methods were a living example of the precept that he inculcated. The aunt was as much the attraction as the uncle. She, by her loving and thoughtful interest in the affairs of these boys, some of whose mothers were dead, and others whose parents were a long distance away, filled them with courage to overcome the difficulties of their years.

"And so for years Cousins John, Frank, Ed. and Henry passed in and out of their door as freely and as frequently as they could have, had it been their very homes, and they were always greeted by as smiling a welcome as if it had been their own father and their own mother."

The following letter from Miss Ada C. Davis, the daughter of my mother's sister Martha, who has been for many years a school teacher, adds its testimony to the pleasant home made by my father and mother, and freely open at all times to their friends:

"DEAR COUSIN: I recall with much pleasure the time I spent with your dear father and mother, and the many kindnesses that I received from them will always abide in my heart. Auntie was a lady of a remarkably sweet disposition. I was a frequent visitor, and I cannot remember that she ever spoke an unkind word of or to anyone. She was always kind. You know that my dear mother's last illness was very severe, and most of the time your mother was with her. My mother would often say to me, 'Aunt Mercy is so kind.' She kept repeating it, 'Aunt Mercy is so kind.' Auntie was most hospitable and gracious. One always felt at home when visiting her. All who knew her loved her. She was an ideal wife and mother and home-maker. Someone has said that what we have once had is ours forever, and so, though she has passed from earthly sight, I do not feel that I have lost this dear relative whom I so much admired and loved.

"I much enjoyed my visits also with uncle. I well remember the many evenings when he so kindly entertained me with backgammon. As I was a poor player, it must have been tedious for him to spend his time in that way for my amusement. I recall, too, with pleasure, the Sundays when he read aloud from the papers and magazines. I enjoyed that exceedingly. His conversation was most interesting and there was much to be learned from it. I have often wished that the boys who went to school to me could have had the benefit of it. It would have taught them the essentials of success in life. Uncle was always most kindly

interested in my affairs, and this will never be forgotten by me. I shall always remember him, also, as a man of incorruptible integrity with whom great public interests were altogether safe."

Mrs. Rose (Cutter) Coolidge of Concord, Mass., the daughter of my father's youngest brother, Jones, has sent the following:

"The year before my marriage I was a member of my uncle's family for nearly three months, during which time I became better acquainted with him than at any other time of my life. I found him always social, genial, and ever ready for a good laugh.

"As a young girl visiting at his house I had always stood in awe of the busy man who had very little to say to me; but the time of which I speak, in the later years of his life, he was always ready to talk and joke, and if a person had ills of any kind, real or fancied, his was the pleasant, happy nature with which to come in contact.

"One of his maxims I remember, and he had many which he was very fond of repeating, was, 'As a man thinketh, so is he;' and I think he thoroughly believed it.

"As I remember he had very pronounced opinions with regard to what was going on in the world, politically and socially, and after reading his morning paper, we generally had the benefit of those opinions.

"Another characteristic of my uncle's which I remember was the love for his summer home at East Jaffrey, N. H., and I can see now his exuberance of spirits and the zest with which he entered into the life of the place, seeming to enjoy every breath he drew, for he was a man of splendid physique and perfect health at that time."

These are only a few of the many affectionate expressions from the numerous nieces and nephews who loved and respected my dear father and mother. They on their part were always interested in the welfare of these nieces and nephews, and often lent helping hands in many ways. My father remembered in his will all his nieces and some of his nephews.

The closing thoughts of this chapter were written by my father's sister, Mrs. Abby J. Fletcher, at the age of eighty.

"In memory of dear brother Leonard. I was nearly eight years his senior and remember well his birth, and how pleased we were to have another little brother; and as he grew to be a little boy I think of him as being of a cheerful disposition, joyous and happy, always ready to do his part, honest and industrious, and from his early youth his motto

seemed to be, 'Take care of the pennies, and the dollars will take care of themselves;' and as his years numbered he guarded well his deportment as a gallant, and chose a companion later in life, which proved a happy union, and two daughters were given them as a result, and they were truly a happy family.

"As a business man and financier, I think he excelled; was prospered in the accumulation of a large property, which he has left to his surviving family. At last the summons came to lay down his arms and join the dear ones gone before. He was one of nine children, and only four remain; the others have passed over to the other shore, to which the remaining are fast hastening and soon will be there.

"A few thoughts written by his sister Abby, Sept. 13, 1897."

CHAPTER X.

LAST DAYS.

Dr. Enos H. Bigelow, one of the attending physicians during my father's illness, has prepared the following:

"The first knowledge of the disease which after six years proved fatal came early in 1889. After three-score years of strength, he was to feel the weight of gradually increasing weakness and disability. It was a new and strange experience, calling for all the patience and fortitude which he could command. His vigorous health had made it difficult for him to understand the limitations of weaker men; but now a long and bitter experience was to teach him the pains of a body subject to disease. The last hard battle of his life he fought with courage and fortitude. Life was pleasant to him. His business interested him. He loved his family and friends, and to give up all was hard. Yet he rarely lost, for a moment, his composure and self-contained manner, which had been the habit of a lifetime. His patience and kindness to his family were unfailing, his courtesy to his friends and acquaintances constant.

"He attended as usual to his business until the last two years, when his son-in-law, Mr. H. W. Baxter, Jr., left the Brighton Bank to assist him and finally take entire charge of his business affairs.

"During this period he found great relief and enjoyment in summer in the rest of his country house at East Jaffrey. Here he hoped to find renewed strength and here he did find many a pleasant hour in the cool stone house set among the beautiful trees he had known and loved from boyhood. The long summer days he would drive over the familiar roads among the hills, where as a boy he had lived and worked and played.

"The summer of 1894 found him too weak to leave his home in Boston for Jaffrey. In May he spent several weeks with his daughter in Framingham, going sadly home with the feeling of weakness heavy upon him. He leaned more and more upon his daughters. Their unfailing care and tenderness comforted him. Mr. Baxter gave him all the thoughtful service of a son, and Mrs. Stevens, long devoted to the family, ministered to his wants with untiring zeal. The end came peacefully at last. The strong man like a child longed for rest. He gratefully thanked his daughters and faithful attendants gathered about him for their kind-

ness and calmly waited for the going out of life. "This is the end of life," he said, and rested in peace.

"Rarely does a man die so quietly, calmly, with mind and body so composed."

After mother's death father said very decidedly that when he died he wished for a private funeral, and for that reason we felt it necessary with the death notice to add that the funeral was private.

On the beautiful summer afternoon of July 16, 1894, those who were nearest and dearest assembled in the reception room of the home, No. 1 Arlington Street, around the black broadcloth casket which contained all that was mortal of Leonard R. Cutter. While the loved form was much emaciated by disease, the large head and fine brow showed the character and determination of the man.

The services were simple. As Rev. S. E. Herrick, pastor of Mt. Vernon Church, which the family attended, was in Europe, Rev. L. R. Eastman of Framingham conducted the funeral services. They consisted of Scripture reading and prayer and the rendering of three musical selections by a male quartet.

Two sons-in-law and his nephews acted as pallbearers, and with sad hearts we followed the remains to Mount Auburn, where in a beautiful lot on Crystal Avenue, with the reading of the Episcopal burial service, we laid the body of our dear father beside that of our sainted mother, which had been laid there three months previously. The lot was purchased by father in April, after mother's death, as he always objected most strongly to owning a lot before it was needed. Here side by side were laid to rest the bodies of husband and wife, who for over forty years had side by side borne the cares and pleasures of this life, forming characters for time and eternity. United in life, they were not long divided by death, but together entered into the joys of that country of which St. Paul writes: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

The following notices appeared in the daily papers at the time of father's death:

Ex-Alderman Leonard R. Cutter died at his home, No. 1 Arlington Street, at 9.30 o'clock last night, from the effects of acute diabetes.

Mr. Cutter has been a sufferer from this disease a long time, having to practically give up his work about the first of last January, but he has only been confined to his bed about two weeks.

Mr. Cutter was a native of the Granite State, having been born under the shadow of Mount Monadnock, in Jaffrey, Cheshire County, July 1, 1825. He received his education in the common schools and academy of his native town, and until twenty years of age he spent his time upon the farm, with the exception of three terms of winter school which he taught between the ages of seventeen and twenty years.

He came to Boston in 1845, and found employment in a grocery store, where everything was sold in the line of groceries save intoxicating liquor. After serving a six-year clerkship he went into business for himself, in which he continued ten years, and then engaged in the real estate business in this city, and at his death was a prominent real estate owner.

He was married in Brighton, in 1852, to Mercy, daughter of Phineas and Mercy Taylor. He leaves two married daughters, Agnes E., wife of Enos H. Bigelow of Framingham, and Emma A., wife of Horace W. Baxter, Jr., of this city.

Years ago Mr. Cutter was one of the most prominent men in city politics, and filled a large number of responsible positions with credit alike to himself and the city. He was one of the assessors in 1859, '60 and '61, was a member of the Board of Aldermen in 1871, '72, '73 and '74.

He was chairman of the board one year, and acting mayor the last month of 1873, the mayor having resigned. He was a member of the Boston Water Board six years, and Water Commissioner eight years, serving as chairman of the board four years, and retiring in 1883.

Upon his retirement from the Water Board special resolutions, commendatory of faithful performance of duty, were tendered him by the board.

Funeral services will be held at his late residence, No. 1 Arlington Street, at 1 P. M. next Monday.

—*Boston Herald.*

Ex-Alderman Leonard R. Cutter died at his home, No. 1 Arlington Street, at 9.30 o'clock last night. Mr. Cutter was a native of New Hampshire, having been born in Jaffrey, Cheshire County, July 1, 1825. He received his education in the common schools and academy of his native town, and until twenty years of age he spent his time upon the farm, with the exception of three terms of winter school which he taught between the ages of seventeen and twenty years. He came to Boston in 1845, and found employment in a grocery store. After serving a six-year clerkship he went into business for himself, in which he continued

ten years, and then engaged in the real estate business in this city, and at his death was a prominent real estate owner. Years ago Mr. Cutter was one of the most prominent men in city politics and filled a large number of responsible positions with credit alike to himself and the city. He was one of the assessors in 1859, '60 and '61; was a member of the Board of Aldermen in 1871, '72, '73 and '74. He was chairman of the board one year, and acting mayor the last month of 1873, the mayor having resigned. He was a member of the Boston Water Board six years and Water Commissioner eight years, serving as chairman of the board four years and retiring in 1883. Upon his retirement from the Water Board special resolutions, commendatory of faithful performance of duty, were tendered him by the board.

Funeral services will be held at his late residence, No. 1 Arlington Street, at 2 P. M. next Monday.

—*Boston Transcript.*

The funeral of Leonard Richardson Cutter, once a prominent figure in Boston municipal affairs, was held this afternoon from his late residence, 1 Arlington Street. Few persons were present, the attendants being mostly relatives and intimate friends.

Rev. L. R. Eastman of Framingham Centre conducted the services, which were extremely simple. They consisted of Scripture reading and prayer by the clergyman, and the rendering of three musical selections by a male quartet.

The pallbearers were the nephews and other male relatives of the deceased, and the interment was at Mount Auburn.

—*Boston Globe.*

At the time of my father's death, beyond my own loss, I felt so keenly the irreparable loss sustained by my children in the removal of the direct influences of their grandparents' lives, and at the same time a great responsibility to carry that influence to them as directly as I could. With this feeling and at the suggestion of a mutual friend, I commenced this memorial sketch, which with all its omissions and commissions I give to my children, trusting that it may make real and practical to them the lives of these grandparents, who died before they were old enough to remember them, but whose indirect influence and loving-kindness they have reason never to forget.

APPENDIX.

ANCESTRY OF MERCY TAYLOR, WIFE OF LEONARD R. CUTTER.

Mercy Taylor was born in Harvard, Mass.; her father, Phineas Taylor, was a farmer there, or in Boxborough, an adjoining town, for a number of years; her mother, Mercy Fairbank, was a native of Harvard and always lived there, or in the next town of Boxborough, until a few years before her death, when the family moved to Lowell. While in Lowell they contracted typhoid fever and two of the family died, also a hired man who lived in the family; my mother was very ill at the time, but she recovered, while her mother and one sister died. At the mother's death the family separated; my mother with her older sister Elizabeth (afterward Mrs. Mann) and a younger sister Martha (afterward Mrs. Davis) went to Boston, where they were employed in sewing. They were near their oldest brother, Jacob, who was married and had a home in Brighton, from which they were married and went to homes of their own.

I have been unable to find a perfectly satisfactory account of the Taylor branch of the family, although I have searched in various directions. Unsatisfactory as it is I give it, hoping that the children of the future will correct or verify as the facts may need.

The separation of the town of Stow and Boxborough in 1783 and the loss by fire of the Stow records relating to years about the time of my grandfather's birth, have been obstacles in the way.

I find in a book relating to the town of Boxborough, entitled "A New England Town and Its People," by Miss Lucie C. Hager, the following:

"In the latter part of the seventeenth century three brothers by the name of Taylor sailed from England for America, making their homes within a mile and a half of each other.

"When these first three pioneers, Ephraim, Phinehas and John Taylor, came to this section, the country was wild and wooded. They felled trees

and built their houses. Their farms joining, although a mile and a half from each other, they thought themselves near neighbors."

These I infer are the emigrant ancestors of the family.

On the tenth of March, 1783, just after the formation of the town of Boxborough, the officers of the new town were chosen, and among them Capt. Silas Taylor was chosen an assessor and Ephraim Taylor one of the highway surveyors and collector and Capt. Phineas Taylor one of the deer reeves. The Ephraim last mentioned was my grandfather's father.

From the records of the town of Stow, the inscriptions on stones in the cemeteries of Harvard and Boxborough, and records in family Bibles I have gleaned the following:

I. Phineas, son of John and Esther Taylor, born Oct. 25, 1716; died June 5, 1790.

The name of Phineas Taylor occurs in the History of Harvard in the list of those who served in the French and Indian War from Aug. 13 to Aug. 26, 1757.

Their Children.

Silas, born June 12, 1743; married Mary Davis of Acton, March 9, 1766.

II. Ephraim, born April 10, 1745; married Ruth Davis of Acton, Feb. 8, 1771; died March 27, 1811.

Tabitha, born Sept. 11, 1747; married Ebenezer Bush of Becket, Feb. 20, 1769.

Phineas, married Sarah Hazeltine of Harvard, Feb. 7, 1778.

Dorothy, born Sept. 7, 1755; married Levi Wetherbee, Nov. 20, 1777.

Israel, born Oct. 27, 1758.

Mary and Ruth Davis, the wives of Silas and Ephraim Taylor, were sisters of Capt. Isaac Davis of Acton, who fell at Concord, April 19, 1775, and to whose memory the monument in Acton is erected.

Children of Ephraim and Ruth (Davis) Taylor.

Phineas, born Dec. 6, 1778, in Stoughton, Mass.; died Oct. 6, 1784.

Ephraim, born May 19, 1781, in Stoughton, Mass.

Dorothy, or Dolly, born July 19, 1784, in Boxborough, Mass.; married Johnathan Ward of Stockbridge, Madison County, N. Y.

III. Phineas, born in Boxborough, Mass., Sept. 15, 1789; married, July 3, 1811, Mercy Fairbank of Harvard, Mass.; died, Dec. 23, 1866, in Acton.

Children of Phineas and Mercy (Fairbank) Taylor.

Jacob Fairbank Taylor, born July 2, 1812; married, March 31, 1836, Sarah Whitney of Harvard; died Jan. 4, 1890.

Johnathan Wood Taylor, born Jan. 12, 1814; died Jan. 28, 1814.

Sarah Davis Taylor, born July 1, 1815; died June 2, 1832.

Elizabeth Barnard Taylor, born Feb. 17, 1817; married Joseph Mann of Boston; died April 11, 1896.

Johnathan Wood Taylor, born Jan. 6, 1819; died Nov. 20, 1844.

Ephraim Hanley, born Dec. 20, 1820; married April 19, 1843, Susan Baxter; died Dec. 15, 1895.

IV. Mercy Fairbank Taylor, born July 27, 1822; married Leonard R. Cutter of Boston in April 15, 1852; died Jan. 27, 1894.

Martha Taylor, born July 6, 1825; married, April 1853, William W. Davis of Harvard; died Dec. 8, 1878.

Dolly Ann, born May 1, 1827; married Sept. 30, 1851, ——— Jacques; died April 23, 1869.

Nancy, born Jan. 16, 1829; married, Jan. 25, 1861, William N. Jacques.

The youngest member of the family of thirteen is the only one living. She is a widow and lives with her sons in Berwick, Iowa.

From the "History of the Town of Harvard, Mass.," I have collected the following facts relating to the Fairbank family, from which my grandmother came:

FAIRBANK ANCESTRY.

The first Fairbank homestead in Harvard is that now owned by Andrew Fairbank. The house is very old, though most signs of its age are concealed under modern improvements. It is probably in part the original dwelling of the first Joseph Fairbank, who was my mother's great, great grandfather. The house was built about 1720. Deacon Joseph Fairbank was the son of Lieut. Jabez Fairbank and the grandson of Jonas, an early proprietor of Lancaster. Jonathan Fairbank, the father of Jonas, came from Somerby, England, which was also the residence of John Prescott, whose daughter Lydia became the wife of Jonas, March 28, 1658.

The Fairbank family were severe sufferers during the Indian wars, and Lieut. Jabez attained local celebrity in military affairs. It probably was Joseph who appears as the "little son" in the famous episode of the massacre of Sept. 11, 1697, as narrated by Rev. Timothy Harrington in his "Century Sermon," in the following:

"Mr. Jabez Fairbank, who was at his own house half a mile's distance and designed to bring his little son from said garrison, mounted his horse, which came running to him in a fright, and rode full speed into the gate, but yet nothing suspicious of an enemy. However, this was the means of saving the garrison; for the enemy who were just ready to rush into it, supposing they were discovered, gave over the design."

Joseph Fairbank married Mary Brown, April 11, 1718, and thirteen children were born to them. He was the choice of his townsmen on May 10, 1740, for their first representative to the Great and General Court, but modestly declined to serve. He was one of the first four deacons of the church in Harvard, which held its first recorded meeting Dec. 19, 1733, the pastor being John Seccomb. He figures very prominently in the history of the church. He was succeeded as deacon May 8, 1766, by his oldest son Phineas. Joseph Fairbank was town treasurer from 1736 to 1740, and selectman in 1733, 1735, 1743, 1745, and 1752.

This epitaph to his wife may be found in the Harvard Cemetery:

"Here lies
Interred the Body of
MRS. MARY FAIRBANK
Relict of
Deac'n Joseph Fairbank
who departed this Life
Nov'r 14th 1791
Aged 91 years 11 mos
and 6 days."

Amos Fairbank, the ninth child and fourth son of Joseph and Mary Fairbank, was born April 2, 1737. His older brother, Phineas, who succeeded his father as deacon of the church in 1766, resigned, and on Nov. 28, 1786, he succeeded him. His name is on the muster roll of a foot company that marched for the relief of Fort William Henry as far as Springfield. Service Aug. 13 to Aug. 26, 1757. Sept. 26, 1774, his name appears as ensign in what is called "The Oldest Company."

We find his name as Lieutenant under "The Militia Provincial Regt. of Footmen of the Militia Comm'd by Col. Asa Whitcomb, 4th Comp'y, whereof Isaac Gates is Capt., who marched to Cambridge on ye Nineteenth April last in Consequence of an Alarm, who returned again not enlisted into the American Service."

In 1780 he served as a Committee of Correspondence and Safety. About 1798 he was one of the signers of the call for a meeting of the

promoters of the Social Library. He was selectman in 1781, 1789 and 1790. He was a licensed innholder from 1770 to 1773.

In the Harvard cemetery is the epitaph to his wife:

"Here lies buried
the Body of
MRS. LUCY FAIRBANK
Wife of Mr. Amos
Fairbank Deceased
Nov. 12
1767, Aged 28
Years and 12 days."

Under the marriages by Rev. Joseph Wheeler is this:

"April 23, 1760, Amos Fairbank and Lucy Gates."

Jacob Fairbank was the second son of Amos and Lucy (Gates) Fairbank. The first son, also named Jacob, died an infant. Jacob Fairbank was born May 6, 1762. He was one of the corporals of the Harvard Rifle Company, which was organized April 29, 1822. On the resignation of his father as deacon, he succeeded him in that office and was one of the first deacons at the reorganization of the church, Oct. 10, 1821, after which time it was denominated "The First Congregational Church in Harvard connected with the Col. Con. Society." Dec. 30, 1824, Jacob Fairbank resigned. His name is in the list of those from Harvard who served at West Point from Sept. to Nov. 18, 1781.

In the Revolutionary War those detailed for guard duty were frequently boys, old men, or others in some way unfitted for field duty. There were from time to time details of soldiers for guarding prisoners of war at Cambridge and Rutland. At the latter place among the guards in 1779-1780 was Jacob Fairbank, then a youth of 17.

In the marriage list of 1792 is found:

"March 20, 1792, Jacob Fairbank and Sarah Goldsmith, by Rev. Edmund Foster of Littleton."

They had three daughters; the oldest was Mercy (my mother's mother), born March 20, 1793, and married to Phineas Taylor.

Nancy, the second, born May 4, 1794, and married to Samuel Bacon.

Sarah, the third, born Sept. 2, 1801, and married to Daniel Hartwell.

My grandmother, Mercy (Fairbank) Taylor, died May 13, 1832, aged 39 years, having given birth to ten children, of which my mother was the seventh child.

From the *Granite Monthly* of December, 1883:

HON. LEONARD RICHARDSON CUTTER.

The city of Boston is not the metropolis of Massachusetts alone; it is the chief city of New England. In commercial importance this city is second to none on the Western Continent, except New York. As a great emporium it has drawn within its limits the most energetic and enterprising men from every section of the Union, especially from New England. These men have grasped great financial problems, have organized and combined capital and labor, have inaugurated enterprises extending through distant states and foreign countries, and have had, like the merchants of Antwerp and London, a world-wide reputation and influence.

The state of New Hampshire has contributed her quota to the long list of successful merchants of Boston, as well as to the distinguished statesmen of Massachusetts; men who, while becoming thoroughly identified with the state of their adoption, have never lost their affection for the place of their birth and the scenes of their childhood.

Love for his native town is very marked in the case of the subject of this sketch; a gentleman who in early manhood left his paternal home to seek his fortune in the city, and while eminently successful in acquiring riches, has gained and retained the respect and confidence of his fellow-citizens.

ANCESTRY.

1. RICHARD CUTTER, the progenitor of the Cutter family, son of Samuel and Elizabeth Cutter, came from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England, with his mother, and settled in Cambridge, about 1640; was admitted a freeman, June 2, 1641; joined the Ancient and Honorable Artillery of Boston in 1643; was a member of the church; married (1) about 1644, Elizabeth —, who died March 5, 1661-2, aged about 42 years; married (2) Feb. 14, 1662-3, Frances (Perriman) Amsden, widow of Isaac Amsden of Cambridge; was the father of seven children by each wife; was a cooper by trade; and died June 16, 1693. He was buried in Old Cambridge.

2. EPHRAIM CUTTER, born in 1651, married Bethia Wood, lived in Charlestown and Watertown, and had eight children. He was an officer in King Philip's war.

3. JOHN CUTTER was born July 23, 1700; married Rachel Powers, lived in Lexington and Woburn, and died Nov. 20, 1747.

4. JOHN CUTTER, born Jan. 9, 1726, lived in Waltham, Shrewsbury and New Ipswich, N. H. He married, Nov. 16, 1749, Susanna, daughter of Joseph Hastings; had eleven children, and died Sept. 27, 1771.

5. JOSEPH CUTTER was born May 13, 1752, at Lexington, Mass.; married Rachel, daughter of Nehemiah Hobart; was a farmer, and settled in Jaffrey, N. H., where he died June 25, 1840.

6. DANIEL CUTTER was born Feb. 2, 1784, in Jaffrey; married, Nov. 18, 1806, Sally, daughter of Col. Timothy and Rebecca (Bateman) Jones of Bedford, Mass. He was a prominent farmer in Jaffrey, and died Sept. 23, 1868.

7. LEONARD RICHARDSON CUTTER, son of Daniel and Sally (Jones) Cutter, was born in Jaffrey, July 1, 1825. He received his early education in the public schools of Jaffrey and at the Melville Academy. At the age of seventeen he gave up the idea of obtaining a classical education, and for three winters he was engaged in teaching, working during the summers on his father's farm, and building up a robust frame.

Ten months before he arrived at man's estate he left his native town and sought employment in Boston. His services were secured by Joseph Mann, a retail grocer, with whom he remained for six years, when he succeeded to the business. For the next ten years he conducted a retail grocery concern.

About 1860 Mr. Cutter embarked in the real estate business,—a line in which he has been eminently successful. Herein his creative genius and executive ability have had full sway. He was the first builder who erected tenement houses in Boston, drawing the plans himself, without the assistance of an architect.

Having implicit confidence in the rapid growth and ultimate prosperity of his adopted city, he has invested largely and wisely in real estate; and his good judgment is demonstrated by the steady accretion of his property, until to-day his name is high on the roll of the money kings of the city. The fact that he has become the owner of a piece of property is a certificate of its worth, and its advance in value is sometimes the work of minutes, not of hours or days.

Mr. Cutter's city residence, on the corner of Beacon and Arlington Streets, is one of the landmarks of the city, and is famed as one of the most elegant and substantial private structures in New England. Its interior is chastely yet sumptuously furnished, everywhere indicating the refined taste of its owner. The summer home of the family is a charming mansion, built of granite, beneath the shadows of old Monadnock, in Mr. Cutter's native town of Jaffrey.

In politics Mr. Cutter was an old-line Whig, a firm believer in Daniel Webster, and upon the decadence of that party he affiliated with the Democracy. In 1859 he first became actively interested in politics, accepting a place on the Board of Assessors, to which he was elected by the City Council. In 1870 he was elected a member of the Board of Aldermen, and for three successive years was re-elected. In 1873 he was chairman of the Board, and for some weeks was acting Mayor of the city—an office which he filled with ability and discretion.

As an alderman he assisted, in 1873, in the organization of the Board of Health, and served on the committees on claims, police, fire department and paving, usually in the capacity of chairman.

His sterling good sense has been of great advantage to the city. He is conversant with all the wants of the public. Of undoubted integrity, he is thoroughly independent. No clique can flatter or force him. He looks to what is right, and does it, regardless of consequences.

From 1871, for twelve years, Mr. Cutter served on the Board of Water Commissioners; for the last four years in the capacity of chairman. In this office his ability, efficiency, faithfulness, integrity and capacity have been very apparent. He was and is ever opposed to jobs, corruption, extravagance and unnecessary expenditure.

He married, April 15, 1852, Mercy Taylor of Boston. Two children grace his home; Agnes Elizabeth and Emma Adelaide.



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06438 365 4

